

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV

DECEMBER, 1903

NO. 6

Shall We Revise Our Program Forward or Backward?

THE stately stream of the revolutionary socialist movement of the world is accompanied by little side currents and backflows, like all great streams. One of the most notable of the counter-currents in the socialist movement is the tendency toward so-called revisionism or opportunism. The historian who attempts to classify the tendencies expressed by these two terms will find it difficult to group them all together under one head. But broadly speaking, one might call revisionists those who frame the theory of this side current of socialist thought, and opportunists those who seek to apply the new theory in practical party work and in parliament. The principal characteristic of this tendency is not that it revises the Marxian doctrine, for no one is more diligently engaged in applying the keen blade of critique to this doctrine than the revolutionary Marxians themselves. Its principal mark of distinction is that it revises the Marxian doctrine in a direction which brings it into conflict with the revolutionary element. It finds fault with the course of the great revolutionary main current and seeks to divert it into side channels. In order to clearly understand in what respect this new philosophy differs from the original Marxian philosophy, it will be necessary to state the fundamental theses of the two.

The Marxian philosophy declares that the economic foundation of society determines the form of human activity and thought; that the history of all human societies since the introduction of the principle of private property has been a history of class struggles, waged for economic and political supremacy; that in present capitalist society, there are three distinct economic classes: the capitalist class who are in control of the essential means of production, the working class who are proletarian in character, being

in possession of no other means of existence but their labor power, which can only be applied by its sale to the capitalist class, and the middle class who are partly capitalist, partly proletarian in character; that the majority of the middle class are being reduced, by the process of capitalist production, to the ranks of the economically lowest class, the working class; that the capitalist minority of the middle class and the capitalists are becoming less and less essential in production compared to the working class; that the ever more intensified economic antagonism between the capitalist class and the working class, and the laws of capitalist production itself, make the downfall of the capitalist system economically inevitable and produce a corresponding intensification of the political class struggle between the two contending forces; that this class struggle will end in the victory of the working class; and that this class will inaugurate a system of collective production based on economic and political equalities which exclude the existence of all classes but one, the working class.

The fundamental theses of revisionism are not formulated so concisely, but they may be stated in substance as follows, taking as their basis Eduard Bernstein's work, "*Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*." That the Marxian conception of historical materialism is formulated too dogmatically; that the Marxian conception of the class struggle still contains some of the "dangerous elements of Blanquism" and is too catastrophic; that the economic inevitability of the collapse of capitalism cannot be fully demonstrated; that the middle class does not disappear from society, but simply changes its character; that the class antagonisms do not become more intense, but milder. The final aim of the historical mission of the working class is not denied by revisionist philosophy, but recedes almost out of sight before the present day activity of the socialist movement, as they would have it.

The purpose of this article does not require a further analysis of these fundamental theses as to their soundness. I am simply stating the conditions, not analyzing their theoretical origin. I am comparing what others have formulated, not seeking to justify the scientific claims of one side or the other. I can therefore proceed to state that the Marxian philosophy has given rise to tactics which follow the so-called revolutionary method, tactics which aim to keep step in the uncompromising political evolution of the working class with the economic evolution of the capitalist system and to accompany the intensification of the economic class struggle by an intensification of the political class struggle. It does not pretend to cure the evils of capitalist society by the old method of symptomatic treatment, but by the abolition of the causes of the evil. The revisionist theory, on the other hand, has created a tactic which is so free from the "dangerous elements of Blanquism" that it has a decided affinity for the utopian attempts of Proudhon to emancipate the working class by the help of the capitalist class

or for the abandoned Lassalleian standpoint of securing the aid of the capitalist state for the amelioration of the condition of the working class. The revolutionary method keeps the class lines constantly and clearly in view; the revisionist method blurs or even obliterates them.

The salient points of the Marxian and of the revisionist tactics are supposed to be summarized in the following resolution, which was adopted by a vote of 288 against 11 at the Dresden convention of the German Social Democracy, September, 1903: "The convention repudiates emphatically the revisionist attempts to change our present tried and victorious tactics in such a way that the conquest of the political power by a defeat of the capitalists would be replaced by a policy of conciliation with the present order of things. The consequence of such a policy would be that our party, instead of being a movement aiming to revolutionize the present capitalist society, would be transformed into a movement which would be content to reform the present society. The convention furthermore condemns the attempt of glossing over, in the interest of a gradual approach to the capitalist parties, the ever increasing class antagonisms. The convention instructs its representatives in the reichstag to use the greater power acquired by an increase in the number of mandates and of the mass of socialist voters in the interest of the proletariat as provided by our platform, to work energetically for the extension and security of the political liberties and equal rights of all, and to carry on a still more aggressive campaign against militarism, against an increase of the navy, against colonial expansion, against imperial world politics, and against wrong, oppression, and exploitation of every kind."

The discussion of the resolution at the Dresden convention reproduced, in a more pronounced form, the phenomena which had appeared in the wake of Bernstein's above named work. Bernstein strenuously denied that it was his intention, or even a logical conclusion from his standpoint, to abandon the ground of the class struggle. He held that the resolution did not represent his case fairly and therefore voted against it. Most of his followers also claimed that they were not revisionists in the sense defined by the resolution, and that, since it did not fit their case, they could very well vote for it. And so they did. This lack of unity on the part of the revisionists was also shown in their theoretical discussions. In the literary discussions, Bernstein often found himself compelled to deny that the conclusions of so-called Bernsteinians could be derived from his criticism of the Marxian doctrine. And whenever revisionism was pressed for a concise definition of its position, the majority of Bernstein's followers forsook him. The same lack of unity is also shown by the practical opportunists. While the German opportunists claim to be in full harmony with the Marxian program and method, the Italian and French opportunists have formulated a socialist program of their own, and

drawn the very conclusions which Bernstein repudiates. And while the German opportunists, in spite of their lack of harmony in theory and practice, have expressed themselves in favor of the unity of the party, the French and Italian opportunists have established harmony between theory and practice by divorcing themselves from the revolutionary method, forming distinct opportunist parties, and going to the full length of the practical consequences of such a step. The revolutionary Marxians are a unit on the fundamentals enumerated above and on the revolutionary method.

But apart from these differences between revisionists and opportunists, there are other differences between revisionist-opportunists and revolutionary socialists that complicate the situation still more. These differences seem to be mainly traceable to certain misunderstandings, which are expressed in the charge that the revolutionary element rejects all present day work for palliatives and is working intentionally toward a catastrophe, and on the other hand that the revisionists are undermining the independent existence of the party by neglecting the class lines. Neither of these charges can be logically connected with the theoretical and practical position of the two camps. The revolutionaries cannot be blamed for any catastrophes that may follow in the course of social evolution, because there is no fundamental distinction between evolution and revolution, such as some revisionists affect. The Marxian philosophy defines revolution as a certain stage of evolution. Hence catastrophes lie in the very dialectic of capitalist development. We do not seek these conflicts willfully. We are born into the midst of them. Between the choice of meeting a catastrophe by preparing for it or meeting it unprepared, the revolutionary socialists prefer the former alternative. Therefore they endeavor to organize the working class in harmony with this process of evolution and work consciously toward the stage where the economic revolution will be accompanied by the political revolution of the proletariat. Whether this will bring on a catastrophe will depend in the last analysis on the capitalist class, not on the working class.

On the other side, the revisionists seem to have a secret horror of the idea of a final climax between the contending forces in the class struggle. And the revisionist theory of the decrease in the intensity of the class antagonisms furnishes the scientific basis for this view. Nevertheless, this policy cannot evade the final catastrophe any more than the Marxian tactics can. It only leaves the proletariat unprepared for it.

As for the charge that revisionist tactics must necessarily and logically lead to a dissolution of the party or of the party discipline, this is founded on the similar misapprehension of the facts as the charge of catastrophic intentions. The German and Belgian Socialist movement has not suffered in unity and discipline, in spite of its tactical differences, while the Italian and

French Socialist movement has. Hence there must be some deeper cause to explain these results; they cannot be traced to the theory of revisionism itself. Kautsky sees a step toward the solution of the problem in the distinction between theoretical revisionists and practical opportunists. Of course, there is such a distinction, and I have made it in the introduction of this article. But the same distinction can also be made between theoretical and practical Marxians. That is a perfectly legitimate and rational distinction, but it explains nothing as to the fundamental differences between Marxians and revisionists. The theory is simply the mental workshop for the socialist politician, be he revolutionary or revisionist. The trouble must be sought deeper.

In my opinion, the cause of the tactical differences between the revolutionary main current and the revisionist counter current is found in the fact that no socialist program has so far made a clear distinction between the class struggle in the electoral battle and the class struggle in parliament. And yet there is a very marked distinction between the two. It is the fundamental difference between the maximum program and the minimum program, between the fundamental socialist platform and the immediate demands. While in our electoral campaigns we are distinguishing ourselves from all other parties by the maximum program which can only be realized by the revolutionary method and by a majority of the voters of a nation, we are forced, while representing a minority party in parliament, to confine ourselves to the minimum program, which is essentially non-revolutionary and symptomatic in character. This minimum program offers little opportunity for the employment of the revolutionary method, but lends itself much better to the opportunist method. The Dresden resolution has not solved this contradiction. It starts out with a ringing declaration in favor of the revolutionary method, but ends with a weak program which that method shall realize at present. The resolution is, therefore, unable to give either the Marxians or the revisionists their just dues.

The distinction between the maximum program and the minimum program is plainly that the one is our real platform, while the minimum program is nothing but a set of instructions given to our representatives in parliament for their guidance in parliamentary action. To the fact that the Communist Manifesto,* in 1848, has not made this distinction, and that the first German Socialist platform did not correct this mistake, is due, in my opinion, the whole trouble which the revisionist ideas have caused. From this contradiction between the revolutionary method and the opportunist immediate demands spring all the difficulties between Marxians and Bernsteinians in Germany, Guesdists and Jauresists in France, Ferrians and Turatians in Italy. The authors of the Communist Manifesto had at least a good reason for attaching an opportunist program to their revolutionary manifesto; and the

same reason, that of compromising with heterogeneous elements, was still active in the formulation of the Gotha program of the German Socialist Party in 1875. But the Erfurt program of that party, in 1891, was no longer subject to such considerations of expediency. On the contrary, every consideration of that period was in favor of separating the campaign platform from the working program of the elected representatives.

There is a very logical reason for this differentiation of our campaign platform from the parliamentary program. The campaign platform is the basis on which the whole body of socialist voters is moving in elections as distinguished from all other voters. But the program for parliamentary action outlined by the immediate demands is only the basis for the movement of our representatives. These representatives get into office only because the whole body of Socialist voters is moving on a platform which draws a sharp class line between socialist and capitalist voters. But after they have been elected, it devolves upon them to carry out the instructions embodied for their guidance in the immediate demands. The whole body of socialist voters cannot take any direct part in the realization of the immediate demands. They must be realized by the representatives alone.

On the other hand, the demands outlined in our straight socialist platform cannot be realized while we are a minority party. They require not only the action of our representatives, but the active participation of the majority of the nation. In this they differ from the immediate demands, which may be enacted into laws without the active participation of the voters. But when we become a majority party, parliament as an independent law making body ceases to exist, and the power of legislation passes into the hands of the rank and file of the socialist majority, who set about inaugurating the co-operative commonwealth.

It is clear that this fundamental difference between the minimum and the maximum program, between the action of the representatives of the party and of the whole party, should be plainly expressed by a separation of the one from the other. Nothing should go into our campaign platforms but the typical socialist demands. And the immediate demands should be published in the form of a handbook for our representatives, to be used by them in their parliamentary work, and by our agitators for propaganda purposes. Such a separation in no way interferes with the present day activity of our representatives, but rather paves the way for a more elaborate immediate program. And at the same time such a separation of the fundamental platform from the opportunist program removes all possibility for any election compromises that might endanger our separate existence as a party. It leaves no room for any opportunism in election campaigns, and that is the only dangerous opportunism. Opportunism in parliament is powerless to hurt the stability of the move-

ment, because the party membership, and in a wider sense the mass of the socialist voters, have it in their hands to elect candidates that will not compromise, even in parliament. And since we have put the principles of direct legislation in practice in our party affairs the rank and file of the socialist movement is alone to blame if it places opportunists into responsible positions.

The further consequences of the separation of our principles from present day opportunism are still more significant. This step will make that possible which the Communist Manifesto was unable to accomplish: It will make the adoption of a uniform international socialist program a possibility.

We are fond of boasting of our international character. We proudly point to the fact that the class-conscious working men of the world have already solved for themselves what all the sentimental capitalist philosophers were unable to accomplish—the question of international peace. But as yet we have not manifested our international solidarity by anything but international congresses and an international socialist bureau. We have neglected to do that by which all parties document their solidarity. We have not demonstrated to the working classes and to the capitalist classes of the world that we are international because we are all standing on a uniform international program. But if we can meet at the same international congress and elect delegates to the same international bureau, why not have first of all an international program?

The only thing that has prevented the adoption of such a program is precisely the immediate demand tail, which had to be adapted to local conditions. With the separation of the minimum program from the maximum program there is no longer any reason why we should not adopt the same program in all countries of the globe.

I will not urge the adoption of such a program for any opportunist reasons. I will not point to the fact that the existence of a multitude of socialist programs has not only made it possible for the capitalists of one nation to claim that the socialists of another nation were not socialists at all, but also enabled the capitalists of certain nations to play one socialist party against the other socialist party of the same country. I will not mention the fact that a uniform program would force the Jauresists in France, the Independent Labor Party in England, the Socialist Labor Party in the United States, to show their true colors and to either unite with those who are willing to adopt this uniform program or to stay outside and confess that they are either anarchists or reformers. I will not base my appeal for a uniform international program on such and similar reasons. I am content to claim that a uniform program for all socialist parties of the world is a logical and matter-of-course demand.

I shall not presume to formulate such a program. There is

not the slightest doubt that our various delegates at the next international convention in Amsterdam will easily give us a program that will be acceptable to every sincere and class-conscious socialist. And I am satisfied to leave it to the rank and file of all socialist parties whether their delegates shall be instructed to work for the adoption of such a program or not. A united action of all revolutionary socialists in the world is sooner or later indispensable. Let us furnish to the world the unmistakable proof that we are one and the same *International Socialist Party*.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

Socialism and the Storthing Elections In Norway.

“**T**HERE is no room for socialism in Norway.” We hear this assertion continually whenever anyone begins to talk of the outlook of socialist politics in our little fatherland. “We have a Paradise of freedom on earth. The Constitution of 1814 placed the internal government of the kingdom absolutely in the hands of the people, in 1821 the nobility was abolished, in 1837 local autonomy for municipalities was introduced. Here there are no class distinctions, all are equal.” Then we are further referred to the fact that with the extension of parliamentary government in 1884, so great reforms were carried through that the lower classes of the people have no longer any reason for dissatisfaction. Trial by jury was introduced in 1887; in 1889 the new educational law was adopted providing for compulsory instruction for all children, while at the same time the oversight of the school was placed completely in the hands of the parents, and in 1892 the factory inspection law and the law referring to accidents to workmen were enacted; in 1898 universal suffrage in State and municipality was introduced, and in 1900 municipal suffrage was extended to women. With such things as these before the eyes it is asserted that there is no longer room for any far-reaching radicalism. The results of the last year, however, show that this is an error. Many great democratic journeys on the road of legislation have already been made. But much more still remains to be done. And this shows that there still exists a very good field for socialism.

The labor movement in Norway dates from the year 1848. At that time a young student, Markus Thrane, seized by the ideas of that year of revolution, arose and made himself the spokesman of the interests of the laboring class. He founded many labor unions, advanced the demand for universal suffrage and worked for social democratic ideas. The poet, Henrik Wergeland, one of the greatest intellects that Norway has ever brought forth, was in a certain sense the forerunner of Thrane. But he was much limited by his Chauvinism and did not dream of making the cause of the oppressed people a class movement, although he was a firm comrade in the struggle against capitalistic and official power. Markus Thrane founded a movement based on the class struggle. But this could not be endured in “the free and popularly governed Norway.” The spokesman of the laborers, because of his socialistic activity, was sentenced again and again to imprisonment. This destroyed his health, and he was soon obliged to give up his work, and during

the years from 1850 to 1860 the labor movement wholly disappeared. The single party that represented freedom of thought was the so-called "farmer party" with Ucland as representative in the Storting and later Johann Sverdrup as leader. By the help of the Thraniten (Social Democrats) the latter was elected to the Storting in 1851. The great question which was then upon the programme was the Lieutenant Governorship and the position of the Council (during his residence in Sweden the king had a lieutenant governor in Norway). This office was abolished at the end of 1873 and in 1884 the Council was granted admission to the Storting. The government, which wished that the king should exercise an absolute veto on this law, was overthrown by the imperial court. This important decision gave rise to the most intense party struggles. In the midst of this the union movement and social democracy re-appeared. In 1872 the first trade union was founded, and in 1883 the first social democratic paper in Norway "Unsere Arbeit" was called into life by Christian H. Knudsen. In 1844, the first political labor union in Christiania with a purely socialist programme was founded, and in 1877, the Norwegian labor party held a congress in Arendal. This party was made up from social democratic and radical labor unions. Because of the participation of liberal elements the programme was formulated along radical-liberal lines, but by the year 1888 this was changed in the direction of social democracy.

In the beginning the tactics of the labor party were directed towards supporting the radical left, which had become so strong in the discussion of this Council question that it had a majority of more than two-thirds in the Storting. The time had now come for the laborers to push through the demands which the Left had placed upon their programme, for example, trial by jury, school reform and universal suffrage. Simultaneously, however, the labor party was carrying on its propaganda for special labor demands.

The democracy suffered at this time a great disillusion, in that its greatest and most victorious leader, Johann Sverdrup, who had become a Minister of State in 1884, betrayed his trust on the question of suffrage, and declared that "Norway cannot be governed with universal suffrage." Owing to this and the question of union with Sweden, the Left was split. The conservative part drew near to the Right, and the radical wing proceeded with its democratic policy. Johann Sverdrup was expelled and Rektor Johannes Steen became the leader of the radicals.

The conditions of the union between Norway and Sweden have always been a source of dispute, not only between the two countries, but also between the two parties of the Right and Left in Norway. As a result of the outcome of the struggle over

the governorship, the condition had been reached where Norway and Sweden carried on all external relations in common and had a common consular service. The Left demanded that Norway should have its own ministry for external affairs and its own consular service, while the Right wished to maintain the unity. The struggle about this led to violent uprisings in the united governments. In order to meet these uprisings, the Socialists in 1892 demanded the dissolution of the union; for they reasoned correctly that the unsatisfactory condition of the relations of union was the cause of these disturbances. The larger portion of the Left agreed with this proposition. To be sure, the Socialists laid no great importance upon it. They supported the Left because of the social policy which it followed. It is a very peculiar fact that the radical Left during the years round 1890, in many respects, followed a purely socialist policy. The leaflets and pamphlets of the Left contained many violent attacks on private property and capitalism. The Left placed universal suffrage upon its programme, together with the eight-hour day, the protection of the right of coalition, universal popular insurance, etc. But when it came to working with the outspoken Socialists, the Left refused to act. Socialism appeared to the farmers as a sort of specter that sought to drive them out of house and home. Nothing remained for the Socialists, therefore, who were in a despairing minority, but to vote with the Left. In 1897 for the first time the Socialists of Christiania voted for their own ticket. But even upon this ticket, undoubtedly on account of the conditions of suffrage, there were a number of the representatives of the Left. After the election of 1897 the Left had a great majority. Shortly afterwards universal suffrage was granted to all men over twenty-five.

Meanwhile reactionary tendencies began to appear in the ranks of the Left. After the election of 1891 the insurance of laborers against accidents was proposed and the question of universal popular insurance was agitated. The elections of 1894 gave the Left only a narrow majority, but shortly afterwards a shortened labor time of 53 hours a week was introduced into the governmental workshops, and the promise given that the eight-hour day would be introduced. But the law for the protection of the right of coalition was always postponed. In 1897 there was only a single vote lacking for the adoption of a satisfactory proposition. During the years 1898 and 1899 the country was visited with a severe commercial and industrial crisis, which brought suffering and destruction throughout the country. The people cried out, and the Left, which was principally composed of farm owners, younger capitalists, speculators, etc., began to be frightened at its own social policy. It would not listen to anything

further about great social reforms. Everything must now proceed circumspectly and step by step. However, the Left was able, in the election of 1900, to hold the country on the question of union, so that it obtained a two-thirds majority. Then, for the first time, there arose a strong opposition within the Left. This, however, was not radical, but, on the contrary, reactionary and in the highest degree antagonistic to laborers. This opposition so gained the upper hand that the Left no longer dared to take up the eight-hour day. Popular insurance was left untouched, and when the law proposing the protection of the right of coalition was laid before the Storting (April and May, 1903), twenty-four members of the Left voted for the imprisonment clause proposed by the leader of the Right. Fortunately, this incomplete legislation was rejected by the Lagthing.

Under these circumstances the Socialists saw that independent parliamentary tactics were a necessity. The treachery of the Left had brought about, in addition, great discontent with the party, even in its own ranks. The labor party, which since the beginning of the 90's had been sailing under a purely socialist flag, began to receive recruits rapidly. At its foundation it had only about 100 members, while in the year 1903 it had 13,500. It was now large enough to stand upon its own feet. The situation had, however, essentially changed since the last election. The Left had since 1894 begun a violent struggle with Sweden. The consequent disturbances were, after the elections of 1897 and 1900, pushed still further under the regime of the minister of war, Stang. The expenditures for the navy arose at one time so high that they amounted to twenty-five million kronen in a total budget of one hundred million. In many circles of the Left a war against Sweden was even discussed. But simultaneously a peaceable solution of the consular question arose out of the negotiations which the government of the Left was carrying on with Sweden. These negotiations led to an agreement that the Swedish and Norwegian governments should each have its own consular service, and that the relation of the consular service to external politics should be determined by a uniform law, "a regulation law," subject to the endorsement of both governments.

The Conventions of the Right, of the Left and of the Socialists expressed their approval of this outcome. Nevertheless, there arose a strong opposition within the Left. The fanatical disturbers, of whom Stang and Konow were at the head, declared that the regulation law bound Norway in relation to her external policy. They wished, therefore, if we could not at once obtain our own consular service, "to take matters into our own hands" and force things through, even if this led to war with Sweden. As a result of these acts the position of the Left became very

contradictory. This furnished good material for the agitation of the Right against the Left, in the same way that the factional disturbances of the Left, together with its unsatisfactory social and political position, furnished the Social Democrats good weapons against their former political associates.

The Left had sunk into a caricature of a party. Before the present elections it struck out the great social political demands from its programme. The law for the protection of the right of coalition, the law of popular insurance, and for a shortened labor time, all were struck out of the programme. The Right and the labor party accepted as the fundamental position of their programme direct suffrage. The Storting's elections are indirect. The qualified voters choose electors (one for each 100 voters in the country and one for each 50 in the cities); these meet and choose the representatives of the Storting. The Left wished, however, direct voting only in the cities, not in the country. The policy of union was the only point where the party sought to maintain its old position. The Right captured the voters for the present by a "liberal" programme. It surrendered its opposition to separate consular systems, promised the pensioning of officials, etc. But as a new point of its programme it announced "battle against all socialist projects and the protection of private property."

Socialism alone in this election represented freedom of thought and progress. Its electoral programme in its essential demands was that of the German Social Democracy, to which were added a number of special demands, the repeal of unjust laws and the like. And this programme gave to the Socialists of Norway a result they had not dared to hope. The Left received a most pitiful overthrow. The question of union was no longer a cause of division. There was practical agreement on this point. The present election for the first time in our country turned on questions of social policy. The Right laid the emphasis in its agitation upon the battle against socialism, and the Socialists directed themselves mainly against the disturbances and the social reaction. The election gave the most gratifying result, and the Socialists created for themselves at last a firm position. For the first time avowed Socialists were elected to the Storting. To be sure there were only four, but when one remembers the insignificant number of votes cast by the party in 1897, then this number is not to be considered small. At that time the party received only 947 votes. The result of the elections of the last two years are as follows:

1900.	Socialists.	Left.	Right, Democrats.	
Country districts	1,187	93,550	68,074	4,076
City districts	6,253	29,116	27,759
Total	7,440	122,666	95,833	4,076

In 1900 76 Storthing representatives were won by the Left, and 38 by the Right, but the Socialists elected none. The result at the next election is somewhat different:

1903.	Socialists.	Left.	Right.	Democrats.
Country districts	10,130	66,675	69,000	6,174
City districts	14,649	22,705	33,410
Total	24,779	89,380	102,410	6,174

In 1903 the Socialists elected four Storthing representatives, the Right 63 and the Left 50 (the number of representatives has been increased by three since 1000). The Socialists gained complete control of only one electoral district, namely that of Tromsö in the North, which sends three representatives to the Storthing. This is all the more remarkable in that in 1900 there were no social democratic votes from this district. The Tromsö district was hitherto indisputably the possession of the Left. The victory is, aside from the peculiar social conditions among the population, due essentially to Comrade Dr. Alfred Eriksen, pastor in Karlsö. He worked tirelessly as organizer, speaker and editor. His paper, "Das Nordlicht," was like a flaming torch. At the last election in this district the Socialists had 4,128 votes against 1,804 of the Right and Left combined. Eriksen is one of the three representatives to the Storthing from this district. The fourth representative of the Socialists comes from the three cities of Tromsö, Bodö and Narvik in the north. Narvik was made a new electoral district in 1900. The Socialists were really victorious only in Narvik, at the direct election; the Left was victorious in the two other cities, and therefore had the majority; for Tromsö and Bodö had together many more voters than Narvik. But the electors from Bodö were angry at those from Tromsö because the latter had always succeeded in having the representative to the Storthing elected from their city. They united with the socialist electors from Narvik and chose Comrade K. J. Berge from Narvik as representative to the Storthing. Berge is a very able and widely traveled man. He is a Catholic, but his electors are Lutherans. He edits the paper "Fremover" (Forward) in Narvik. There will be still a fifth Socialist sitting in the Storthing. Egede-Nissen, the representative from Hammerfest, Vardö and Vadsö (all in the extreme north of Norway), is in complete accord with the programme of the Socialists. But he did not declare himself as a Socialist and was elected from the Left. His electors, however, were fully aware of his socialist attitude.

The Democrats are a radical-liberal labor organization. Their votes were divided at the present election in two districts.

Hedemarken and Christiana, where they brought about the election to the Storthing of the state's attorney, Gastberg, and the teacher, Myrvang, as radical socials. Many of their supporters were Socialists.

The statistics given above are not absolutely correct, for the official tables have not yet been published. But they do give a correct picture of the electoral situation. In relation to the Social Democracy, however, they do not show the full result which has been obtained. In a few cities the Socialists and the Left fused and voted the same ticket, so that it is impossible to distinguish the votes of these two parties. Many of the democratic laborers in the districts of Hedemarken and Christiana were also Socialists. We have reason to believe that our total vote in the whole country is in the neighborhood of 30,000. A conservative paper estimated our vote at 27,000.

The outlook for further and greater results for the Socialists is of the best. The Left has shown its incapability of fulfilling its social tasks; the Right uses as its rallying cry "battle against all Socialist Projects," and whoever wishes to assist the progress of social or political reform in this country can do nothing else than enter the ranks of the Socialists. The socialist labor organizations go steadily forward. The whole number of industrial laborers in the country reaches nearly 80,000. Of these about 16,000 are organized in unions.

The Socialists have participated with good results in the municipal elections. As yet, however, they have not attained an absolute majority in any municipality. But since in the great majority of cases proportional representation exists, it has been possible to elect a number of party comrades in the municipal governments. Since 1900 those women who had reached their 25th year and paid taxes upon an income of 300 kronen in the country and 400 kronen in the cities, or who were married to a man who paid taxes, have also had the right of suffrage in municipal elections. At the municipal election of 1901 48 per cent of the qualified voters among the women in the cities and 9.4 per cent in the country, have exercised their rights of suffrage. A total of 98 women have been elected to positions in municipal governments. In 1901 the Socialists elected a total of 147 municipal officers. We are certain to double the number during the next year.

In the country socialism is rapidly winning ground among the small farmers and fishermen. During the last few years a strong socialist movement has developed among these classes. This development proceeds particularly fast in the North. If it continues to advance as rapidly as at present, the famous Land of the Midnight Sun will soon have only socialist representa-

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

tives in the Storting and only Socialists in municipal governments. The agitation in Norway finds its greatest obstacle in the great distances to be traversed and the difficulty of communication, together with the scanty population. In this wide-spread country there are only 2,200,000 people and only seven to the square kilometer. But even these obstacles are giving way before the conquering hosts of socialism. The present accomplishments are great and the future belongs to us even in Norway.

JAKOB VIDNES, *in the Neue Zeit.*

Translated by A. M. Simons.

The Inconsistency of Morris.

OF THE thirty-eight numbers of the I. S. R. published, fully one-half contain the name of Wm. Morris; it has come to such a pass in the Socialist world that his name is synonymous with the highest and best in art, and ere one dare express an opinion on art, he must first approach the shrine of Morris, kneel reverently, count his beads, mumble a few glorias, and in payment receive that inspiration which is due all hero-worshippers.

"Who is this Socialist that he should take up so much room in our art?" some one once said of him. Is it not time that we Socialists paraphrase that sentence by asking, "Who is this artist that he should take up so much room in our Socialism"?

Of Morris the man, poet, artist, scholar or craftsman there can be but one word spoken, but as a Socialist it seems as though he lacked much. His idealism especially fitted him for the Fabian school of dreamers, but wholly incapacitated him for the more earthy Marxism. His analysis of existing economic conditions and their historic relations to other economic periods was so unscientific that he became reactionary. His sentimental soul revolted at the manner in which commercialism was affecting art, and lacking the foresight to fight *through* the evil (as evolutionary Marxism would have taught him to do), he turned his back on the present and future and sought consolation in the companionship of the superstition-soaked priests of the era of mental ossification. The history of the world's art furnishes no similar case of such apostacy, no parallel for such mental cowardice. There never was a period in the world's history but there were those contemporaneously who recognized its imperfections material and intellectual; but the world's benefactors, the promoters of progress, have always been those pioneers who, refusing to submit to their environment or to superimposed authority, have gone forth and broke new ground to stand upon, have fought the world's evils, not by flying back from them nor around them, but *through* them; Morris sought the feathered bed of a bygone age and with the assistance of the emotionalists and faddists of the time he won—for a day.

The beauty of idealism reached its manhood in the Greek scriptures, its senility and decay in the ecclesiastical mysticism of the Middle Ages, and the cure for the evil was naturalism. This was the work of the renaissance. And when naturalism had run the entire gamut, even to the coarseness and brutality of the Dutch School, art did not fly back to idealism, but through the evil of Romanticism, that bastard child of idealism and naturalism,

neither of heaven nor earth, but hanging in the mid-air. Thank God, it died soon! What now? Back to idealism? No.

Idealism was the only art that could live "bowed under a weight of authority"; naturalism was the revolt, that, not knowing what to do with its freedom, flew to the other extreme. Romanticism was the recoil, the child ashamed of the excesses of its parents, seeking to condone their crimes by combining in itself their virtues. It failed, it went to seed in the melodramatic, the emotional, the sentimental.

The history of art is the history of democracy. Idealism was for the intellectuals alone. Naturalism was for the thick-headed *grande bourgeoisie*. Romanticism with its sickly sentimentality was better adapted for the then-rising thin-headed petite bourgeoisie, the empty-headed *sanscoulotte* had, as yet, no art; all the existing phases of art transcended his wisdom, sufficient for him was a full belly and a place to lay his head. The tendency of art in all of its successive changes was to adapt itself to ever larger audiences. Tolstoi to the contrary.

And now art must be brought down to the *sanscoulotte*. But how? His nature must be taken into consideration; he must be approached from the physiological rather than the psychological side. "And thus it was that ethics dropped from art and esthetics took its place." The technical school was born. And with its perfection democracy will have achieved a complete triumph in art. The fourth estate will have an art.

*If the history of art is the history of democracy, it is likewise the history of evolution, and the finger that traces philosophy traces art.

With the breaking up of the feudal system and the consequent breaking up of the old transcendental and ideological systems of philosophy, necessarily came the shattering of all of those forms and institutions built upon the old economic and philosophical systems. The base of philosophy was shifted from metaphysical conjectures to scientific-materialistic deductions,—from the abstract to the concrete,—from the ethereal realms of otherworldliness to the altogether too matter-of-fact this-worldliness, and consequently the problems of 'how to worm your way into a blissful heaven the other side of the moon,' 'how best to float around in the thin aether of an imaginary Arcadia' or 'how best to attain to a thrice threefold condition of sanctimonious sancti-

*The difference between opportunism and impossibilism in socialism, and La Marek and Welsman in biology, however important they may seem to us in this age, will be considered insignificant to the historian five hundred years hence, who will consider as important only what both opportunism and impossibilism held in common against its common enemy, the capitalist system,—or what both Lamarck and Welsman held in common against their common enemy, the theological conception of genesis. In like manner I have risked the anathema's of the so-called conservative historians of art by making broader or more general divisions of art, based upon economic determinism, and utterly ignoring the pedantic definitions and scholastic classifications of the petty schools and cults, reactionary or otherwise.

moniousness," gave way to the very earthly problems of "how to get enough to eat" and "how to adjust your relations with your fellowman"; and from Bacon's "Novum Organum" we slide swiftly down from the clouds and land with a thump against "First Principles," "Origin of Species" and "Capital." Religion and art were the first to feel the effects of the revolution.

Idealism was the dominating principle of art so long as the economic and philosophical conditions warranted of it, and when they changed art changed with them, hence naturalism. But the new economic condition was as yet too unsettled for the new materialistic philosophy to find a firm base for itself, and so art speedily deserted it without having even so much as tasted the real fruits of naturalism (the Dutch went farthest, but mistook coarseness and deformity for naturalism), but having previously deserted idealism it found itself without a home—hanging in mid-air, hence romanticism.

But now we have got our new economic system settled, it is no longer an experiment, but a fact; and now Spencer, Darwin and Marx will adjust a philosophy to it; the last vestige of idealism will be driven from philosophy and it will be placed on a purely materialistic basis. Now art, you may come down out of the mid-air; you need not be afraid! Here is a firm foundation for you. And art came down and adapted itself to the new conditions.

Beauty of idea gave way to beauty of form, objective expression gave way to subjective impression, and suggestion was substituted as a makeshift for idealism. And then came the technical school, the extreme left of the new art. Moral import, goodness, righteousness, truth, perfection and all of the concomitant adjuncts of ethics are swept aside to make room for form. Ethics is dethroned—esthetics is crowned king. Art has become ultra-material; realism is naturalism placed on a firm, scientifico-materialistic basis; beauty is looked upon as a physiological sensation.

To be explicit: Certain lines perpendicular, horizontal, diagonal, straight or curved—certain masses of light and shade—certain colors, hues and tints are so arranged geometrically or chromatically that the impression received by the brain is agreeable (harmonious); add a dash of suggestion and take. You don't like it? No? Well, what else did you expect in this materialistic age? But the subject-matter? Oh, let that shift for itself. And the moral import? Please don't bother us with such questions; sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. We are too busy with the physical construction of our picture, poem or song.

Let the aristocracy of intelligence with their fools paradise of idealism sneer at our esthetics—no mean thing, this technical school, even if only as a stepping-stone. Time will tell. Evolution does not work purposelessly.

And this is the technical school or esthetic art. The creature

of its environment, the product of time, the art of the proletariat, upon which Morris turned his back at a time when this art and the people who needed this art required his services the most, deserted them to attempt to resuscitate an art which they could not appreciate and which could not of its very nature be resuscitated even if it could be appreciated, for "it was not of its time"; deserted them to—sell them fifty-dollar books and thousand-dollar tapestries and unwittingly create a cult of middle-class dilettantes who to-day are socialism's worst enemies. The act was foolhardy; time is proving it so.

But if his antagonism to the technical school was foolhardy, his hatred of the machine was doubly so. Inconsistent Morris, what had the poor machine done to incur your enmity? In two short centuries it had transformed the dull, illiterate, wooden-saboted peasant into the urban wage-worker and surrounded him with at least a modicum of comfort, given him at least a smattering of education and art.

The cheap printed calico, the bargain-counter tapestries, the gaudy-figured carpets and the crude attempts to realize beauty in the machine-made furniture, this was the blackboard class of the proletariat in art, truly better than the thatched roof and mud floor of the medieval peasant. Again he deserted them, imbued with his reactionary ideas.

How are we to account for the inconsistency in this man, who, believing himself progressive, became reactionary, who, laboring in the interests of the working-classes, allowed his left hand to work adversely? That he became a victim of the predominant emotionalism can be the only rational answer.

It was just at this period that the evils of commercialism were at their worst and beginning to manifest themselves to the world in general.

The shockingly revolting condition of the laborers in the factory, the mine, etc., was crying out its indictment against society, with nothing (not considering as worthy of mention the fashionable parlor-economists) to answer back but the novels of Dickens, Hugo and Sue, fag-end of the romanticism so gloriously brought to perfection by Byron, Goethe, Schilling and Scott—remnants soaked in emotionalism.

The voices of Darwin, Spencer and Marx had not yet been heard, but so soon as "The Origin of Species," "First Principles" and "Capital" were written,* the old-fashioned revival as a means of combating the encroachment of materialism must give way to a higher criticism and St. George Mivart; a literature of sighs and tears must give way to a literature of investigation, analysis.

While it is true that these three contributions to modern materialism were given to the world about the middle of the last century, they did not sift down to the public, i. e., become subjects of popular reading and discussion, until the mid-seventies or early eighties.

and action; in the social science charity and pity must give way to the class struggle and political activity; and an art tainted with commercialism and the prevalent emotionalism must give way to—God save the mark!—a second-hand art, revamped by the firm of "Morris, Rossetti & Co."

Every revolution in every branch of human endeavor brings with it, in its transition stage, a series of eccentric excesses from which the weak-minded recoil and which causes all but the strongest-minded to denounce the entire revolution. Morris looked upon the excesses of the transition period and flew to a monastery.

While it is true that the modern technical school (as applied to the graphic art) relies solely upon an appeal to the esthetic sense, and consequently seeks only the physical construction of a picture, still, the future historian will hold, say for example, Aubrey Beardsley (line) and Claude Monet (color) as the excesses rather than the spirit of the revolution. The technical school has come to stay until it shall have served its historical mission and solved the problems allotted to it; and then, if the world wishes to return to idealism, it will return in a body and not be dragged back to please the whim of one man or a petty cult.

Let the failure of pre-Raphaelitism and the triumph of the technical school serve as a warning that evolution is not to be thwarted by emotional fancy nor sentimental obstinacy.

Or, perchance Morris believed as the author of "The Revolt of the Artist" that "art is threatened with sterilization" because "freedom of expression is smothering true individuality and is causing an increasing glorification of technique." God, Father in heaven! And this from a Socialist. Go to, man. There never will be an art in this world until the last vestige of artistic authority is lifted from the shoulders of the individual.—Until then we will simply have *schools*.*

As with art, so with the machine. Morris simply looked on the transition stage, the crude, shabby product of the primitive machine, unlike the more artistic product of to-day, only a quarter

*The fact that this is a journal devoted to the discussion of socialism and not art, alone deters me from entering at length upon this, what I consider to be, the most important question in art at the present time.

"But is it legitimate art?" said a friend of mine (and a socialist at that) to whom I was showing some prints that I intended submitting to the fourth Chicago Photographic Salon. Is it legitimate? Or, in other words, does somebody permit you to do this and call it art? Does some great functionary, judge, jury, clique or *school* kindly condescend to hand down an approval that will make it true art, whether it is or not?

"To what *school* of art do you belong?" said my friend a few minutes later. There you have it, substitute "orthodox" for "legitimate" and "creed" for "school," and you can smell the burning flesh of the—but no, five hundred years of civilization have substituted a more refined (but none the less effective) *censorship* for the more brutal inquisition.

Judges, judges, and ever judges, until every vestige of real art is drummed out of the heads of the novice, and stupidly he takes his place in the procession—creating things according to *somebody else's standard of beauty, not his own*.

of a century later. And what will the future of the machine be? Let us anticipate:

Machinery is of three kinds: (1) To accomplish that which man by virtue of physical deficiencies (absence or limitation of certain natural organs or functions) cannot accomplish unaided; to this class of machinery belongs the microscope; telescope, spectroscope, etc. (2) To create artificially certain natural conditions (or to create artificial conditions or objects), beneficial to the material welfare of man (light, heat, imitations and substitutions); to this class of machinery belongs electric and gas-lighting apparatus, ice-making machinery, etc. (3) To accomplish that which man unaided (save by primitive tools) may accomplish, but to accomplish that something more rapidly, with less expenditure of energy, *i. e.*, more economically. It is with the two last divisions of machinery that socialism concerns itself mostly.

Primitive man found the sickle the most convenient tool with which to garner his wheat, but the scythe by virtue of its longer blade must needs drive the sickle out of the field. Next the "cradle" manifested itself as a greater saver of labor, followed by the mowing machine, still more economical than any of its predecessors. Up to this point the function of the tool or machine was to perform one operation, to cut down the wheat, a performance which may be best characterized as repetition or duplication. But mark you now what occurs: The reaper cuts the wheat and lays the sheaf ready to bind; the self-binder cuts, binds and discharges sheaf all bound.

Then comes the combined harvester and thresher driven by steam or gasoline which moves across the field with 30-foot strokes of its sickle and gathers the grain heads, elevates them to the cylinder, or separator which threshes, cleans and sacks the grain ready to send to the miller.

And what is true of the machinery for the harvesting of wheat is true of all machinery; the more primitive the machine the more is it confined to one single, simple operation (duplication), and the greater must be the expenditure of human energy and care in connection with it. The more modern the machine, the greater the number of its performances (variation) and the less the expenditure of human energy, as witness the linotype, corn-shredder, husker, automatic screw-making machinery, etc.

To sum up: Primitive machinery—duplication, plus much labor; modern machinery—variation, plus little labor.

And is this the end? Come, let us be optimistic. Heretofore the product-varying machinery consisted simply in the combination (in obedience to the predominant law of concentration, I presume) of several correlated machines (e. g., cutting the paper, printing on both sides, pasting, folding, etc.), more or less automatically adjusted; and consequently the variation of product is

not in its last analysis so much of a variation after all, but rather a manifold duplication. But the ultimate goal of invention is machinery that will permit of a true variation of product, of a **greater** suppleness in the hands of man and a greater obedience to his will; nor is this a Utopian dream, but a cold, scientific fact. This will be the third stage of machinery invention, and the twentieth century is already anticipating it.

Machinery will more and more vary its product until—where will it all end? Who knows? Not I. But there is one thing I do know, and which Morris seems not to have known; viz.: *Machinery, like everything else, is subject to the law of evolution.*

CENTRIST.

Australian Labor and Socialist News.

THE heart of the political opportunist in Queensland is made glad. The old corrupt government is overthrown and a coalition government is formed in which two of the members of the Labor Party hold seats. The new government has a following of 42 in a house of 72, and of these 23 are members of the Labor Party. The policy of permeation will now bear fruit. Already signs are not wanting of its beneficial effects! On taking office the new premier announced that no extreme or controversial legislation would be introduced. The ex-leader of the Labor Party, who is one of the new ministers, in the face of this says: "I believe that it is quite possible to be loyal to the premier and the colleagues I have now elected to work with, and at the same time be true to my old principles. In the meantime I would ask the men and women of Queensland who have so long and so earnestly worked for reforms we so much desire, to accept my assurance that it is the sincere belief that the quickest and surest way to get these reforms is by the new departure made that has caused the Parliamentary Labor Party and myself to adopt that course." Another member of the Labor Party, who has lately been raised to the dignity of chairman of committees, said recently that the Labor Party were prepared to go slow and not expect too much from the present government. He rejoiced in the fact that the Morgan government had come to stay. The same individual announced that the Labor Party was not a class party. It has long been evident that such is the case, but this is, I think, the first occasion on which a member of the party has ventured to express it in public. The majority of labor organizations throughout the state heartily endorse the policy adopted, although even the most sanguine of them expect nothing more than electoral reform. At present a system of plural voting is in force, the owners of landed property having a vote in every electorate in which he owns land. An electoral reform bill has been promised by the premier, which will abolish plural voting and extend the franchise to women, but it is not to be introduced till next session. The action of the Labor Party in forming the coalition is only the logical outcome of their departure from the propaganda of their early days. If they had kept alive the agitation in the country for electoral reform, the plural vote would already have been abolished and the franchise extended. But no! The conducting of a revolutionary agitation was in complete variance to the policy of the vote-catching practical politician. It is now only a matter of time before the Labor Party are completely absorbed by the liberal element in the new government. This will clear

the way for an avowedly socialist party, and it is to be hoped that the result of the failure of our present practical labor politicians will be the formation of a revolutionary socialist party, whose aim will not be to reform the capitalistic system out of existence.

Practical politics in New South Wales has also shown how little is to be gained from these measures. The most short-sighted of all of these is the demand for compulsory conciliation and arbitration. In N. S. W. the conciliation and arbitration act has enabled a bogus union to be registered, the Machine Shearers' Union. This union has already caused a reduction in the wages of shearers and bush workers and the Australian Workers' Union have been compelled to accept the reduced rates. A circular has been issued to members in which agreement to this reduction is recommended. This circular contains the following: "Your patience has been sorely tried, we know. The arbitration act that promised you peace, has brought you war." Instead of seeing the utter folly of obtaining a remedy through the arbitration courts they are demanding more arbitration. "A Federal Arbitration Act," they say, "will almost certainly be passed this session and this will enable us to have our differences settled, not for N. S. W. only, but for each of the states covered by our Union. Profiting by the N. S. W. experiences, the *Federal Parliament can be depended upon* to see that no bogus union shall hold up its head, and that the important powers entrusted to the Registrar *shall be placed in capable hands.*" When we hear of the likelihood of a capitalistic government going out of its way to procure justice for the workers, we may well question whether lack of insight and reasoning capacity do not go hand in hand with the mania for practical reforms.

Mr. Sven Trier, a Danish socialist, who recently visited New Zealand, says with regard to the arbitration act: "With regard to this, one thing is unrefutable, and that is that now one union has much less interest in the welfare of another than before the act came into force, each union only working to get one penny more for their people per hour! And the result is that the political interest of the working class is getting smaller and smaller; their broader view of the oppressed classes' demands have changed to a narrow union self-interest.

A Trade Monopolies Prevention Bill was introduced into the New Zealand parliament to prohibit the growth of monopolies. This is a direct consequence of the middle-class nature of the government. It is not to be supposed that this bill if passed, can stem the tide of economic development, but it serves to show what is the controlling power in New Zealand.

ANDREW M. ANDERSON.

The Socialist; the Ideal Peace and Arbitration Man.

*TO ARBITRATION.

Blest Arbitration, boundless boon to man,
Significant assumer of the soul in all,
Appropriate partner in the Peace-man's work,
Declarer of the day when War shall cease—
Hail, hail thy universal sway!

Democracy's defense against all deathly deeds,
Base Battle's bearer to unbottomed grave,
Sincere saluter of contestants with the kiss of peace,
All-uncorrupted, calm, convincer in despite of purchased courts—
Hail, hail thy universal sway!

Announced in notes of joy that jubilantly praise Almighty God
at end of war.
Embodied in the ballot cast that bears behest of ours,
Revealed in revolutions swords rebelled against—
Thou art, O Arbitration, born of Love and Peace, th' acclaimed
compatriot of every cause that cries:
"Come let us reason—not resort to force."

Conspirator that hast conspired to strangle strife;
Well-wisher of the world, most wise, that daily waits to deal
cursed war a death-blow, to his face;
Adviser of the down-trod: "Dare demand, and I will speak
the doom;
Beguiler of the brute to plead where brutes are evermore brought
low—"
Hail, hail thy universal sway!

Conceived by Love incarnate close at hand,
Brought forth for this: To furnish Peace a realm and race complete and fit,
Endowed with daring to demand the earth as thine,
Enthroned in hearts, whose homage hastes where Justice stands—
Thou art, O Arbitration, born of Love and Peace!
Less loved than War by lisping lass unschooled by life,
Less loved than War by wanton, warriors waste their pay and
manhood on,
Less loved than War by world that wounds its Christ to death—

*Published in "The Peacemaker" and "The Advocate of Peace," October, 1903.

But thou, O Arbitration, born of Peace and Love, art now, hast been, and evermore shalt be th' acclaimed compatriot of each cause that cries:

"COME LET US REASON—NOT RESORT TO FORCE."

The preceding poems* were sent out by the author many months ago. Without any concert of action on the part of the editors both poems were published in the October issue of several periodicals. This simultaneous publication called the author's attention anew to the work and occasions in him the following thoughts:

Would it have been possible to have secured the publication of "To Socialism" in a Peace journal, and would any Socialist journal have been inclined to give publicity to "To Arbitration?"

The answer to the first query is undoubtedly No; and to the second, It might have been possible, but was not probable.

Now, why?

It is true that in a recent discussion with Mr. Love, of "The Peacemaker," Dr. Gibbs successfully demonstrated that there is an irreconcilable difference between the arbitration principles as embodied in the eleven cardinal principles of the "Peace Union" and Socialism; and it is equally true that there is now an established and growing feeling of contempt for the results of arbitration as between Capital and Labor in the minds of many socialists; and in order to sift this matter to the bottom I have thought it wise to set forth, confront and consider certain facts.

First: The "eleven cardinal principles" are, so far as I am informed, merely the setting forth of the mode of operation of a particular peace-society towards securing the acceptance of arbitration by parties in dispute together with the reasons which prompt their author and some of the members of the society to take action in the case and a statement of the foundation on which they believe the principle of arbitration to be based. They are in no sense a final embodiment of the principle of arbitration, and a great wrong has been done the cause of arbitration by founding those "cardinal principles" on the assumed righteousness and unchangeableness of capitalism. An equally great wrong has been done and is being done by confusing in the minds of the workers the unsatisfactory results of arbitration in many cases as applied under capitalism with the abstract principle of arbitration. For, just as in voicing the thought "To Socialism" there was never an intention in the mind of the poet of endorsing

*The second poem to which reference is made is the one entitled "To Socialism," published in the October number of the International Socialist Review.—Ed.

everything that might possibly travel under that loved name, so in the case of "To Arbitration" the principle in its perfect application to the needs of mankind *under a just system*, certainly not under capitalism, was held consistently in view.

Just as under the grossly inequitable system now in vogue neither Christianity nor Socialism should be asked to produce their legitimate results, so neither can Arbitration—nor should satisfactory results now be expected. In order to secure even approximately satisfactory results, arbitrators of an unprejudiced and disinterested quality are imperative—these can *never* be secured under a system where the present inequalities of wealth and station are recognized as not only legal but just.

Therefore the Socialist should keep in mind that in condemning and renouncing the application of arbitration to present day disputes he must not so condemn or renounce the principle of arbitration itself; for nothing is more certain than that arbitration, if put in practice under Socialism, would bring about ideal decisions—just and humane and in the vast majority of cases perfectly satisfactory to all parties; and the Socialist of the future is going to need this ideal method of settling disputes which will inevitably arise so long as human beings fall somewhat short of the hypothetical angel estate.

On the other hand, the Peaceman is making a monstrous and fatal mistake when he bases or attempts to base an ideally just system on an altogether unjust, outworn, and about-to-be discarded system. His attempt to make it bring about anything like permanent results under capitalism has never been satisfactorily accomplished until he secured the acquiescence of powerful nations to the plan—in other words backed its decisions by force. And force, next to fear, is the lowest appeal that can be made to a reasoning being, such as is pre-supposed by arbitration. This founding of the principle on anything less or lower than the conception of Socialism, and the making the acceptance of the cardinal principles as enunciated a *sine qua non* of good and regular standing as a Peaceman, whether done officially or in the mind of the member at large, is fatal to the progress of the peace cause.

Second: No class of people, as a class, have more steadfastly and consistently demanded the overthrow of militarism than have the Socialists; and yet the average Peaceman looks with distrust on the Socialist, who is the ideal Peaceman and arbitrator; for only under Socialism, where equality of wealth and station can be secured, is it possible to bring about permanent world-peace or secure disinterested arbitrators.

In looking for the cause of this distrust we find that it arises because few, if any, Socialists have totally discarded and dis-

avowed the right to resort to the arbitrament of war in the final event. That this should be a matter of disagreement between the two bodies is strange indeed; for we find only a scattering handful of the avowed Peace people of the world who are able or willing to endorse Tolstoy's extreme position, which enables him to state truthfully that he would not resist evil even though it took the shape of the rape or murder of his own daughter in his sight. So far from endorsing such a position except by silence concerning it there may be observed the names of many prominent officials of peace organizations on the roll of the League of Peace of England, an organization which avowedly stands for the right of resistance for home defense, and its secretary is a member of many other Peace Societies; and in this country few indeed are the members of our Peace organizations who are not proud of the record of some member or members of their families who gave up their lives on the field of battle either in the cause of Independence or in the late Civil War—where men were deluded into thinking they were fighting for the freedom and enfranchisement of the chattel slaves. Now, this primal right of ultimate resistance to the death for one's loved or for a principle is no more strenuously asserted by the Socialist than by the average Peaceman, could we but secure an open expression of opinion from him. The Socialist is opposed to militarism and to all war, appealing as he daily does to the reason of the people for a decision in his, and their own, favor. He continually thereby acts as an advocate in a great Arbitration Court, whose judge and jury, plaintiff and defendant are identical (not an ideal court by any means); still he pleads with them to render their decision at the ballot box, peaceably, and not on the field of battle, where blood is inevitably shed, lives lost and irreconcilable hatreds engendered. Nevertheless, the ballot is and necessarily must be his only weapon or means of defense—*but only in the present*; for he must not ultimately stand passively by and see the means of the advancement of the race taken by trickery from the hands of the workers—as is now being done in numberless cases and by methods so utterly beyond the reach of all present laws as to make him glance thankfully in thought to the fact that he has at the last always in his own power the right and ability to resist by force this gradual reduction of his fellows to the slave condition.

Does this thought and this gladness concerning it, render him less available as a sincere Peace advocate today? If it shall be decided that it renders him entirely unavailable let all Socialists, as well as all non-socialist members of Peace societies who honestly find in themselves this same thought and gladness (though inevitably coupled with great sadness that such a thought

need ever arise), sever connection with all societies whose constitutions, by-laws or cardinal principles make a resort to war *under any and all circumstances* a fundamental part of the things they disavow and in which they disbelieve. And where will the Peace organizations be?

This much seems clear: So long as we are compelled to live under capitalism no such hard and fast line can be drawn by the societies; though indeed it has been drawn once and for all for them by the government in the infamous "Dick" law—as the societies will discover whenever the law is put in operation. That would leave only absolute non-resistants in the societies. Now, the most earnest and strenuous upholder of the Tolstoyan position in America today—a man I delight to honor, but from whom in this I hopelessly disagree—openly avows that for his part the living completely up to the doctrine of non-resistance is not in him; for which I the more honor him. And even Tolstoy falls far short of a literal obedience to the *commands* of that master he has selected as his ideal. He has elected *perfect* obedience to non-resistance of evil and *partial* obedience to "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor." True, he lives somewhat like a poor man; but until he has utterly divested himself both of titles and possessions he is not a poor man and *can never feel as a poor man feels*. The essence of poverty is the uncertainty as to the morrow's bread—and this no man situated like Count Tolstoy ever has felt or can feel. Moreover, Tolstoy's non-resistance is definitely confined to resistance by act; for a more strenuous resistance by voice and pen to evil of every form, than his this world has never seen or heard.

Why then draw the line sharply in this other matter? Tolstoy is recognized the world over as honestly believing in Christ and as putting in practice Christ's doctrines so far as may be, and so far as his sight is clear, under the system which he by the fact of birth is constrained to endure. So, and fully as much so, the Socialist is a true and earnest Peaceman. He eschews war and the warlike just so far as the day and hour permit. He believes whole-heartedly in the principle of arbitration and appeals to its court for decisions often even when no possibility exists of securing such arbitrators as the principle demands. He daily submits his whole case to the whole court—and reserves only the right of ultimately enforcing the decision which he confidently expects that whole court in the near future to render in favor of his contention. For the present he peaceably submits to all adverse decisions, and proposes to continue so doing. But already are clearly heard the voice of some of the defendants threatening not only to ignore an adverse verdict, but to resist to the death its enforcement. For this cause, and for this alone, the Socialist is

constrained to keep the possibility of an appeal to arms as his reserved right. He will not be the man to break the peace; the peace will already have been irretrievably broken by the rich when, if ever, the Socialist defends and enforces the decision rendered in his favor by the ballots of the people.

It may be said that no attempt has yet been made herein to logically demonstrate the justice of the claim that the Socialist is the *ideal* Peaceman and arbitrator. In the mind of the writer no other proof is needed than the writing and publication of the two poems which serve as a text for these thoughts. Each is the sincere outspokening of a Socialist mind. But to others more may be necessary.

Socialism is admitted to be an embodiment of ideal justice and the securing for the whole people of ideal conditions of life. Even its most bitter enemies and opponents dare bring nothing against it to a reasonably unprejudiced mind except that it is "too good to be true" and "will not work." That it *will not work* under capitalism, or anywhere in its neighborhood, is readily and gladly admitted. While the Christianity of those theologians who concur in the statement that "Christianity is a system of belief, not a life" has measurably succeeded in fulfilling all expectations *they* had any warrant for entertaining, genuine Christianity as taught by the founder has pathetically failed under these same capitalist conditions, to actualize its central doctrine: Loving Brotherhood and Oneness. So will every other even approximately just system. Light and darkness are mutually destructive each to each. One must inevitably give place to the other.

But the Socialist, even under these adverse conditions, is the ideal man of whom we spoke.

First: Because at the same moment that he detests war and discards it as much as any man except, possibly, the extreme non-resistant, he frankly faces the possibility of the day of physical conflict. He devoutly hopes that that day may never dawn, but he is subject to no delusions concerning the fact that if the conflict which he is now confining to the mental sphere can possibly be forced by the capitalist into the physical one it will be taken there and there fought out. For his delusions as to the humanity of capitalism were dispelled long since. This freedom from delusions on that subject is all in his favor. He does not call present-day conditions "peace" simply because only backward peoples or barbarian races are now being legally slaughtered, or because few or many "boundary disputes" and such like matters of controversy between *great* nations (who have discovered that war is too costly, as waged between themselves) have been temporarily or even permanently settled by arbitration. The warman and his master, the capitalist, are well aware that of all

peace-loving people the Socialist is most clear eyed as to their plans for the present and future—and if anything can restrain them in the attempt to carry out those plans, that fact will.

Second: He is even more the ideal Peaceman because he is ever actively a resistant, chronically in revolt against the evils that afflict humanity—but ever with the hope of a better day and of ultimate victory before him. For observe that in order to achieve the things for which our ideal stands we must in all cases be buoyed up by *hope of ultimate attainment*. We must be optimists. Pessimism, as to the present, is perfectly permissible: The present could scarce be worse and be endurable. But as to the ultimate result of our struggle, as to the future of the race, as to the inherent nobility of human nature, we must be optimists of the most strenuous kind. We must believe it and continuously live in hope of it till our faces shine with the light shed by the faith-foreseen oncoming day. Herein is strength; herein is victory! Realize this, and then observe that the non-resistant's foremost man, as a result of a lifetime of thought and endeavor in the non-resistant direction, lands in the blackest pessimism ever voiced to the world or harbored in the heart and brain of a man who consented to survive the present hour. He thinks and says that the hope of the race is to "let it die out." He would create a double-distilled inferno in the interim on earth by leaving the begetting of children to those he considers as less elevated bodily, mentally and spiritually than himself. All really well-intentioned people, according to him, should unite to let the race die out. That, indeed, in its ultimate is peace—the *peace of the grave*.

Compare with that the ideal ever present in the mind of the Socialist; a world more full of happy men, women and children than it has ever been with miserable ones. Realize that the Socialist of today is a man on fire with enthusiasm, filled with love for his fellow man, hating only the monstrous system which condemns him to live the very inequality he hates and detests, and there should be no difficulty in deciding between the two poles of thought (there is no real workable middle position). There should be instant decision that the sincere, disinterested Socialist is and ever will be the ideal Peace and Arbitration Man.

EDWIN ARNOLD BRENHOLZ.

Hilquit's "History of Socialism in America."*

NOTHING offers a greater proof of the permanent position which has been attained by Socialism in the United States than the character of the literature which it is producing.

It is a trite but true saying to apply to such work as Comrade Hilquit has produced that it marks an epoch in the socialist movement in America. It does this in a double sense; it records the completion of the preparatory stage in American Socialism and it presents to us the most scholarly and pretentious volume that has yet appeared by an American Socialist on the American Socialist movement. Almost one-half of the book is given up to the discussion of "Utopian Socialism and Communistic Experiments." Indeed it seems that rather too much space is given to this feature. This is for two reasons; primarily, because they are by no means as important in the development of socialism as this extended treatment would indicate, and, second, because this phase of the subject has been adequately treated in other volumes. The classification which he makes of these communities into Sectarian, Owenite, Fourieristic and Icarian, is the best division of the subject that we have yet noticed. Here and there we run across interesting little items which have been ordinarily overlooked by previous writers, such as the fact that a son of Robert Owen was twice a member of Congress and drafted the Act establishing the Smithsonian Institution.

The summary of the cause of the failure of these communities he states as follows: "But the times of the Robinson Crusoes, individual or social, have passed. The industrial development of the last centuries has created a great economic interdependence between man and man, and nation and nation, and has made humanity practically one organic body. In fact, all the marvelous achievements of our present civilization are due to the conscious or unconscious operation of the workers in the field and mines, on the railroads and steamships, in the factories and laboratories the world over; the individual member of society derives his power solely from participation in this great co-operative labor or its results, and no man or group of men can separate himself or themselves from it without relapsing into barbarism.

"This indivisibility of the social organism was the rock upon which all communistic experiments foundered. They could not possibly create a society all-sufficient in itself; they were forced into constant dealings with the outside world, and were sub-

*For sale by The Comrade Publishing Co. \$1.50.

jected to the laws of the co-operative system both as producers and consumers. Those of them who learned to swim with the stream, like the religious communities, adopted by degrees all features of competitive industry, and prospered, while those who remained true to their utopian ideal perished."

It is in his treatment of the modern movement that we find the matter of greatest value. This portion of the work indicates an extensive investigation into original sources, and preserves for us much matter that would have been very difficult to assemble in future years when the generation that was concerned in these events had entirely passed away. He finds practically no connection between the communistic settlements and modern socialism save that here and there individuals were concerned in both movements. The first real movement that is entitled to rank as forming a link in the evolution of the present American Socialist movement is the work of William Weitling, whose activity during the years 1849-50 aroused considerable interest. The German Turners and an organization in New York called the Communist Club, which had an ephemeral existence, were the only other important manifestations of the Socialist idea in the years prior to the Civil War. This great struggle practically wiped out all movements not directly concerned in the struggle between the North and the South, and there was little sign of reviving activity until the advent of "The International Workingmen's Association." The history of this organization has often been told, and yet there are so few accounts of it accessible that the rather full description given in the present volume is acceptable. It really had but little influence in America and would be of little importance in the history of the American movement save for the fact that it came to America to die, being removed to New York in 1872 in order to place it outside the influence of Bakounin and his anarchist followers. What influence was manifested by the International in America was largely through the National Labor Union, which reached considerable strength in the years 1867 and 1868.

Not the least of the valuable things about Comrade Hilquit's work is to be found in the fact that he has rescued from oblivion many names which now sound utterly strange to American Socialists, but who played their part in building up the movement of which we are now so proud. One of these, William H. Sylvis, was the heart and soul of the National Labor Union, and at his death in 1869 the organization disappeared, although it lived long enough to send a delegate to the Basle Convention of the International. The National Labor Union was not directly affiliated with the International, and most of the sections of the latter organization were composed of Germans, although it finally became cursed with an unnatural prosperity which drew to it "reformers of all shades" and, as is inevitably the case with such

a growth in a socialist movement, brought about its downfall, not, however, until it had organized some remarkable labor demonstrations and left its impress on the thought of the period. It finally died on July 15, 1876, only to be revived again with greater strength and with a form adjusted to the infinitely wider field and duty that lay before it in the new International Socialist organization which still remains.

The next phase of the movement to occupy the field was "The Social Democratic Working Men's Party of North America," which was formally organized on the 4th day of July, 1874, by several sections of the International, which had withdrawn from the organization earlier in the year in January, with some local labor organizations of New York and Williamsburg, Newark and Philadelphia. This greatly grew in strength and in 1877 changed the name to "Socialist Labor Party of North America." This organization sprang into life in the midst of the most wide-spread industrial disturbances this country had witnessed up to that time and received a tremendous impetus from the sufferings and disorder of the time. "The many labor troubles and the general condition of popular destitution of the period had made the minds of the working class more receptive to the teachings of socialism than ever before, and the socialists sought to take advantage of the situation by every means at their command. In all great industrial centers demonstrations were arranged, proclamations were issued, street-corner meetings were held, and some of the most eloquent speakers of the party—McGuire, Parsons, Savary, and many others—undertook extended and systematic lecture tours through the country. Socialist newspapers appeared in all parts of the United States and in many languages. Between 1876 and 1877 no less than twenty-four newspapers, directly or indirectly supporting the party, were established." This movement disappeared with the coming of the capitalist prosperity of the early 80's. With the coming of the hard times of the late 80's the oppressed workers turned again to socialism, but once more the movement was destined to confusion and finally to end in one of the most tragic episodes in the entire history of the working class. It became involved on the anarchist movement and well nigh disappeared when the Haymarket tragedy and the execution of the anarchists took place in Chicago.

Once, again, the movement was slowly built up from the bottom, but each time the builders worked more in accord with scientific principles and amid an environment more susceptible to permanent growth of socialism. There were times of confusion with the Greenbackers, Populists and the Henry George movement; there were dark days of intrigue and a few instances of betrayal. But through it all, socialism was growing. The Knights of Labor movement gave it a great impetus, only to

be lost when that organization fell into disrepute. Out of the contact with the Knights of Labor, to some degree at least, sprang the fatal trade union tactics of the S. L. P., which was to end in the disruption of that organization and the founding of the present socialist party. Here the history practically stops, and perhaps it is as well, for matters since have scarcely sufficiently receded into the perspective of history to enable an impartial account to be written.

The work is one which must compel the attention of every student of American social life, and will form an essential part of any collection of socialist books. Nevertheless, there are portions which are somewhat unsatisfactory. The treatment of American economic development is the most prominent of these. There seems to be almost no conception of the industrial history of America as differentiated from that of other countries. Wherever this subject is treated the whole United States is discussed as if it were a unit, whereas, at any time during the periods covered by the book there were great sectional differences, and these differences were really the main factors in the peculiar political development of America. One is surprised to see a socialist book repeating the nonsense about the disastrous competition of the "bonanza farms" of the west with the ordinary American farmer, when it is now known that these bonanza farms were absolutely helpless in the competition with the ordinary American farmer, and were subsequently competed out of existence.

In the same way there is a decided localism in the treatment of the struggle with the S. L. P. where he declares that: "The insurgents were practically confined to the City of New York, while the sections in the country knew little about the merits of the controversy." This will be somewhat surprising to the comrades throughout the country who were plunged into that fight often with fully as great energy and intelligence as those of New York. We have already criticised the space which is given to the colony feature, but this is more striking in view of the fact that the communistic character of frontier life which has been present in some portion of the country throughout the history of the United States is completely overlooked.

There is also a strong tendency to exaggerate the importance of the Greenback and other reform movements in comparison with the Populist as contributing to the growth of socialist thought. No mention is made of the planks in the Populist platform which were very much nearer socialism than those to be found in the Greenback party, with the possible exception of those which the socialists were able to drag in when they were admitted to the Greenback conventions.

A. M. SIMONS.

The Religion of Resistance.

IT IS our way to laugh with the laugh of the superiorly pitiful at the backwardness of the ancients who inferred that slaves and women had no souls. But like most of our moral derision this laugh of ours has no account behind it—it is only a laugh which does not understand.

Morality is an entirely social relation ; that goes on the face of it. A man cannot be moral alone. Religion is some larger consideration than that of immediate punishment which induces people to be moral. Whatever else religion may have to say about heaven and souls she uses these as accessories of the mundane morals she happens to be teaching. Only a few fanatics who do not know why respectable people went to the trouble of making them religious in their youth have the audacity to separate religion from morals. Any church openly declaring such divorce would be forced out of business at once, and this they all perfectly well understand, though they may not understand true morality. Some ancients and moslems say that slaves have no souls. But we as Christians always make very much of the slave's soul because we want to make so very much more out of the body.

I suppose that there can be no real moral nexus between slaves and masters and that religion in supplying an unreal one for a purpose has at least saved the ancient human families from utterly destroying one another—saved us out of those periods of brutality and ignorance for the time when religion shall have better functions than to invent fables to hold the slaves and keep the masters fat.

A moral code can only have force and meaning between men in equality. The ten commandments were compiled for the use of people who were pretty well to do. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's ox" was addressed to a man who had an ox of his own. No such commandments were ever addressed to destitution. It has no place in a slave system where force or fear only save the master's ox. There is no slave, destitute or deprived man but *must desire* that absent thing, which, being out of his possession, makes him what he is ; and none but such as are resolved to have and keep him a-less-than-man would seek to take from him that sacred desire.

A community that is so organized that slavery, black or white, constitutes its essential requirement must therefore have some men in it that are less than men—men without souls. In free competitive wage slavery we require the largest part of our population to be thus deprived or destitute in order to keep them in the slave ranks. Our system requires, indeed, that the largest part of the

population shall be less than men, and therefore outside the moral relation and having no soul, or only its germ.

Great numerical communities must be held together by force, by habit, by delusion or by the moral consideration—that is true religion. Force can only end itself and society sooner or later. Habit can only last up to its equivalent of physical necessity. Delusion works until several of them begin to compete and no longer, and there is really left for society in the end no other bond than that of the moral consideration. Now equality of conditions alone can provide the atmosphere for that moral consideration.

If the master classes of the world possess the soul life then it must be evident that slaves cannot possess it (or other dependents) except on the assumption that the soul life of religion is not moral at all. In which case it is difficult to understand why the master classes should be religious except as devotees of a war god fighting against the slaves. The assumption of a common soul-nature in all mankind and a common God involves equality of condition and they who work to-day for the increases of capitalistic property in mankind's machinery or means of living are utterly irreconcilable with either. Now, I regard socialism as the restitution of every man's right to spiritual life (including slaves, women and other dependents), and that this restitution must be preceded by a declaration of resistance.

The religion of resistance is not the religion of repression to be smuggled into the mind of the repressed by hireling priests. Resistance is the antithesis of invasion—the invaders therefore will not hire the master's priests to teach us the religion of resistance. We must learn and practice this religion ourselves amidst our own circumstances and against all things that make for inequality of condition, and all that teaching that opposes resistance. Every human being possesses racial intelligence or the capacity for it who possesses a mind; and that racial intelligence in operation is the soul of man. It is not mind as an absorbent of statements or dogmas, but mind as the knower of what to do that gives us our first cheque on the bank of the spiritual life. The free mind observing and acquainting itself with its helps and hindrances is the mind of the human soul which now calls for the religion of resistance.

When a thing is to be resisted one of three events must take place. The resistance must go, the thing resisted must go, or the resister must go. Some actual evil greater than the evil resisted (or the menace of it) must stop the resister and his resistance. Force therefore, as a fact or as a delusion, confronts resistance and nothing more. Whatsoever fosters this delusion or strengthens that force is the thing to be resisted if the evil is to be overcome. To maintain the power of resistance is therefore the first religious duty of the man who seeks the spiritual life. Every man should

repudiate that condition which for himself and his fellows, resists resistance to evil with the menace that it shall be followed with a greater evil than the one complained of. To reduce delusions to facts is the first step of the man struggling with his own and social wrongs. Is there a greater wrong to punish one? Is there a majority of people really kept in bondage by the force of a minority? There is not. No such force exists upon the earth. It is a delusion. To strip that delusion down to fact we have but to cease our contributions to the overcredited forceful class. The capitalists of America have no force at all with which to dominate the majority—only that which out of its own delusions the majority concedes. Withdraw those concessions the force vanishes and the workers are free. We therefore at an early stage in this crusade for the restoration of free religion resist the misuse of our own force against ourselves by correcting our own delusion that any minority can maintain a wrong. If change is the father, resistance is surely the mother of life. No word in the languages of men is so sane, so noble as this word "resistance." It is man's life at the outposts defending itself from that brutal principle of assault, the strenuous life—the aggressive disease of aristocracy. In the energy of resistance we have infolded all the active beginnings of morality and the spiritual life of collective man. In it is the philosophy of democracy; it is a new volume begun every day, and its first chapter is a chapter of wrongs considered and assailed; and its last chapter will be one of wrongs overcome.

The ideal of co-operation is far, very far, ahead of present moral development. The sentiment having positive force in it to marshal and hold men together, to make great things and to gently bind nations together is a social subconscious force operating upon the individual life, but upon which the individual life cannot as an agent act or operate, though he may operate himself into it. There is a hidden, indefinable social potency; the central force of man's history as *a citizen*, the soul of the race, concerning which only one thing I will here affirm. It is a divine (that is, a whole human) dynamic, responding to, rewarding and strengthening the active courage of the man of resistance. Beginning with the body physically and locally, resisting the disagreeable effects separately coming upon it from other things, then proceeding to the resistance offered by the same body, as a whole person, to those effects; then advancing as a mind to the immediate cause of those effects and resisting them in large; then clothing this mental defense with the bodies of many personalities in combined resistance, just as the aversion to a single disagreeable effect was previously clothed with the powers of the whole personality. Beginning as an oppugnance to the series of assaults upon the physical life, of which we are admonished by the disagreeable effects of some things upon us, we move from these ulterior things, involuntarily, as it were, by coil or spiral

movements, towards the Central Human. From resisting simple hurts directly to the avoidance or removal of simple hurts menacing us we move from animal to man. We have made mind matters of our physical hurts; we look behind them to deal with their causes; we begin ahead of them to deal with them before they come. We pass them from ulterior to inner circles for treatment. Our hurts have become evils to be considered in the inner executive chamber of the mind that they may from thence the more effectually be smitten back by the physical hand, if necessary, at the outposts of resistance. Now henceforth more of the life of the resisting man is spent on the mental circles than where the hand is uplifted—a year to think, a moment to strike. Man's mind is more of a collective mind in proportion to its being a mind resisting; for as he continues to resist he continues to learn that rarely and still more rarely is a man called upon to resist alone. Wholesomeness of resistance is soon manifested as wholeness of resistance, and thus the defender becomes conscious of wrongs as interferences by strenuous and unruly property-persons with the general life, resisting which he knows to be the one way left of saving the God thought until that time when men will know what to do with it. When we have done smitting God will begin to build. Let us leave the ruder hurts and elementary evils of the past far behind us and go on to attack our collective wrongs and so hasten that day.

Evolution has been the history of the development of man as an animal forming and an animal feeding. Biologically and economically, evolution describes the process by which the physical individual has thus far developed and survived. But swooped in together by modern economic forces each man is now so lost in many men that evolution can no longer find him alone, or one line. He has retired to involution, and if evolution will remain in the business of an expounder of progress she must follow him in as a social intellect from this point of resistance to wholeness of mind.

The polar activity of the religion of resistance is power from all to each; it is that which takes place between the vital affluence of the Center Human and the single emptiness of each remote resistant. It is a social endowment falling upon the heart and head of that uttermost man who resists wrong. It is the divinity of the whole human life drawn off as the negative drains the positive cloud of electricity. But, again, the Collective Human draws back from each resistant that which it gave, plus the new experience, to be returned again on call to the next resister's demand, plus whatever new experience has passed in and which the new resister is able to employ—a flux and reflux between man fighting and God helping.

To kick a vicious dog away from one's legs, to drive it away from the school house, is a more religious act than to invade

China with guns having crucifix triggers. The Chinaman invaded is on the resister's side on the religious side of the question, while the invader is on that of the mad dog. But, alas, since the American man with the cross gun nor the Chinaman with his primitive walls are neither the invader nor the resistant, but only, in both cases, the mere instruments and slaves to the real foes behind them—the controlling aristocrats of two nations, the rulers of slaves. The first thing for the human race everywhere to do in all Chinas and Americas is to resist slavery ere we come to that age of responsibility which shall usher it to involution. Broadly then all men are called upon everywhere to resist the private control of social activities. Before we can have the spiritual we must either throw away our chains or be engaged in breaking them.

Throughout all previous resistances to the disagreeable and hurtful we were only preserving ourselves alive to fight this good fight of private courage that wins us social growth.

Another circle of resistance is the opposing of that which promotes personal contests and differentiation. We will also be found opposing that which stimulates without promoting the singleness of life, false catholicisms and false publicisms. And also that which promotes the fallacy that *res publica* can flourish at the cost of any persons. And that which prevents the will of man from being as linked together and mutual as the machineries of production. And that which prevents the minds of men from being as world-fluent as the wares of the merchants. And that which prevents the organization of labor from stretching as widely as the hide of labor is stretched to be sweated. And that which blinds us to the world-values of our own small wrongs and the divinity of our first resisting. And that which prevents us from seeing that between capital and labor there is being played or fought out the drama of sin versus holiness. And that which hinders the outflowing of every man's mind into world connections. And that which steals away our leisure and burdens with misinformation and fraud our spare hours of thinking. And that which removes our objects of interest and resistance from the present time and place to later on. And that which lifts dogma above deed. And that which alienates the social forces of labor, law and wealth from community to persons. And that which diminishes private courage by the overshadows of a profound and mighty past and future. And that which overburdens the private mind or body beyond what it is able to bear. And that which exaggerates the personal responsibility while disarming the person. And that which places us under law rather than in life. And that which substitutes self's view of society for the social view of self. And that which presents ideals to suffering men as magnets to draw them from their evils or their evils from them. When truly the ideal should be a sword with which, in

hand, smitting our wrongs, we should be marching backward fighting into the citadel of common life.

I appreciate that whatsoever leaves less than absolutely simple, the way of the resisting life is but entangling the people's feet in the painful undergrowths of another theology. Therefore I say, He that is to resist is not my disciple, but my teacher; he is the teacher of all the ages. Are you giving resistance? You are giving the only lesson that ever yet instructed tyranny.

Right resistance should be acute and contiguous to begin with. Resistance is the whole social program of every man until, as a whole, man learns his program of substitution and acquires the totality of mind, habit and will required for the whole doing.

The savior of society is before all the man who is afflicted; therefore the philosophy of evils rightly handled is the philosophy of salvation. How then shall we resist our evils? First, by collecting them into the present time and assailing them in unified and concrete forms; that is, never to strike a coming evil until we have done well by the one that has come. Second, by never doing alone what can be done with others; that is, choosing of two evils which calls for resistance that one which more than one person together can *now* resist. Whether that united resistance be deemed better or worse as to its present efficacy the religious power of it is the enlargement of the issue beyond the limits of personal resentment and the co-operation ensuing. Primarily, the mind being the executive chamber of resistance, becomes the rogues' gallery, where we keep an eye upon our wrongs; that is, the personal physical hurtings which have become group hurt, harm, injury, damage. The rogues occupying this gallery are of two sorts, transitory and permanent. To the inner chamber of evils let us therefore transfer those hurts, harms, injuries and damages which have become habitual; that is, which have become evils.

As doctors learn to translate physical disagreeable sensations into groups and orders of sensations which also afflict others, pathology and medicine become scientific; for a drug which could only cure one person would never find a place in pharmacy, and a king's doctor is no doctor at all; nay, a specific in medicine can only be tolerated until a more vitally comprehensive medicine has been discovered. It is by ordering and grouping our hurts that we rise from the anarchy of private smiting to the science of social resistance. Believing as I do that the evils of the world exist only as long as they remain personal, and that they are all removable by the grouping process, and confronted by that collective zeal and intelligence which I am calling the religion of resistance. And believing that it is the practice of such intelligent resistance which alone educates us as persons into righteousness, and which alone draws upon us, as persons, the dynamic rightness of the human soul collective—the divinity of the whole

—it is evident that this religion of resistance is based upon the material facts and everyday experiences of mankind, that it is strictly objective, inductive and constructive advancing from singles on to larger generalizations until the largest generalization *becomes itself* the dynamic force of the whole. This seems to me a sound scientific process of dealing with our scattered wrongs. But I believe it to be more than scientific.

Science, at its best, is but the most correct statement of operation of forces; but science ends with the accuracy of its own statement. If science could, along with its accuracy of statement, and by means of that accuracy and completeness, impart an energy ingermied of its own correctness, that is, a corrective energy, so that while stating processes it was performing, then science would become in nature as this religion is in man. In economics, politics, sociology, I hold that there is such a scientific religion. It is the philosophy of democracy; it is the monopsychic democracy; it is the religion of resistance uttered in the proletarian revolutionary socialism of this day in America.

In this religion of democracy there can be no selfishness, in the "bad" sense attached to that word; inasmuch as the thing that hurts one person alone is outside of the democracy, just as the thing that benefits one person alone is outside of it. A wrong or a strength which cannot be expressed in the terms of, nor is included in, the wrong and strength of others is a subject to which democracy is indifferent. If I find myself in a position where my wrongs are my own alone, where only I myself can take measures to drive them from me, where I do things best by myself, then I am afflicted with the greatest of human misfortunes.

By the word good I understand the strength of God as already defined in this paper. Such good no man can possess by himself. A man can possess what we now call "goods" and possess them selfishly, but they are no part of democracy; they are only to be resisted and smitten away from good men as chains that bind them outside of the democracy.

What, then, is a good man? The man who has social strength, the man who is intelligently resisting, waiting or preparing to resist the obstructions of democracy, and his goodness may be graded in proportion to the magnitude of the number of other men with whom, and in whose common interest, he is making such resistance and preparation.

It is evident, then, that we can have no good children or bad children for praise or blame save only as their minds have been made receptacles of socialisms or selfisms. No economically or politically disarmed women or men are good save as books are good; possessors of good thoughts and utterers of good words, the results of public instruction they may be (I do not mean the

public-school instruction of to-day), but *instruction in the public way*. They are good, better or best in proportion as they happen to be caskets of public truth.

Here is no room for chastizing the child or the ineffective adult by this last. Only if I had a heart for chastising a child I would surely select for the whip that one that sensed itself to be better than the others.

Of all the odious and sickening things under the sun, remove me far from that man or child from whose lips proceed the stench of his own single righteousness. This is the dry rot of all false religions, that they are but differentiators—manufacturers of saints and sinners. Such religions, one and all, and all such affections, are evils to be strenuously resisted by the spirit of democracy.

They only have no God who feel themselves to be always under the necessity of holding him in their consciousness. They only have a god who knows of a constitution of things upon which they can lay working hands. The wrongs of society and of persons afford such a constitution of things to every man. Resistance to capitalism and all its attendants affords the most welcome and fruitful field for developing divinity in the lives of men.

PETER E. BURROWES.

Socialism, or Anarchist Communism.

IN THE many good articles that appear in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, by the many different writers, and varied conditions of thought, an occasional confused idea must inevitably creep in. The tendency of the times is toward confusion of thought. This modern Babel is the result of the clash of class interest, the clash between those of the working class, who thoroughly understand their class interest, and the capitalist class in its entirety, who realize that their class interests are being attacked as a class, and not as individuals.

The capitalist class did not pay much attention to any attack during the period that the individual was attacked along political lines, but as quickly as the change was made by the Socialist, and their interest as an entire class was attacked, they immediately secured the service of all kinds of intellectual prostitutes to confuse the minds of the workers, whom they have been and hope to continue fleeing, through the aid of the aforesaid intellectual prostitutes.

Is it any wonder, then, that the capitalists and their cohorts, the politicians, have been successful in pulling the wool of confusion through the lines of thought laid down by many writers. In the September REVIEW Comrade Raphael Buck seems to have bucked up against an anarchist communist—in other words, a sadly confused confusionist. He seems to have imbibed some of this confusion, much in the same way that many people imbibe religion—that is, without question or investigation—when he says, “Anarchist communism is the best and highest stage of political and economic progress”; even if he does mention how foolish it would be to advocate it at the present day. Anarchism simply means individualistic chaos; communism is simply the economics of the heap as advocated by Kropotkin and Elise Reclus. and it is because the Socialist objects to producing wealth and luxury for loafers that he advocates Socialism as it was expressed by Marx and Engels, and it is for the same reason the Socialist attacks both anarchism and communism. Communism is an old Utopian idea, take it in any light you look at it; and as far as anarchist communism is concerned, it cannot exist any more than hot ice or cold fire can exist.

Kropotkin in the advocacy of his theory says that “anarchist communism means a free society voluntarily organized by its members.” Any form of organization must necessarily be a form of government, voluntarily or not; therefore, there can be no such thing as anarchist communism; it is a misnomer.

I am curious to know if Comrade Buck would stand for the

sublime teachings of anarchism, as taught by Bakounin and Jean Grave, and in order to save Comrade Buck valuable time I will give a sample of the sublime teachings of those two worthies below:

"All reasonings about the future are criminal, because they hinder destruction pure and simple, and fetter the progress of the revolution.—*Bakounin*.

Of course Bakounin forgets to mention those two companies of militia by which that great and grand revolution at Lyons was broken up.

Jean Grave in his book, "Moribund Society and Anarchy," discussing tyrannical employers during times of strike, says: "Let us suppose one of the like executed in some corner, with a placard posted explaining that he has been killed as an exploiter. In such a case there is no being mistaken as to the reason prompting the authors of the deeds, and we may be assured that they will be applauded by the whole laboring world, such are intelligent deeds: which shows that actions should always follow a guiding principle." But, as the guiding principle in this case is the natural seeking for the revenge of the savage, further comment on that sublime idea is unnecessary.

Benjamin Tucker, of Boston, says the theory of anarchism is based on the individual; also, anarchism is the doctrine that all the affairs of men should be managed by individuals or by voluntary associations, and that the state should be abolished. Here again we find that association of some kind is necessary to carry on the necessary work of man, and this is an admission, even by the leader of those that boast of their individualism, and means that some form of government is an absolute necessity.

This does not necessarily mean that we (Socialists) will need the vast paraphernalia that is necessary to the maintenance of the present bourgeois form, as there will be no wage slaves to repress in the manner the present ruling class are doing in Colorado, the classes being wiped out, and all having an equal opportunity.

This is, I believe, the only way out of the matter for Comrade Buck, to let him obtain copies of the past and present authors on anarchistic literature, read them through, study them, then compare them with the authors of Socialist literature. He will then note one fact, that each disagrees with the other in most everything; but all agree in the community idea, some in competition and others in ownership of all by all, without the taking into consideration the propensity to laziness on the part of some.

A. F. DUGAN.

Equal Distribution.

COMRADE BUCK in the article entitled "Ascending Stages of Socialism" voices the theory of the aristocratic antagonists to Socialism.

That equal distribution of social product would tend to carelessness in production; that the high rate of remuneration attending equal distribution would simply institute an era of brute gratifications, in which an inordinate sexualism would play an important part, thus increasing the population beyond the limits of subsistence; that equal distribution would establish a premium for slothfulness, and he predicts dire disasters as a consequence upon the inauguration of equal distribution—namely, a constantly decreasing product and a constantly increasing population: all of his statements, forecasts and arguments concerning the future of the Co-operative Commonwealth might simply be dismissed as so many surmises, non-debatable, because non-provable.

But when he ignores the true concept of distribution, the biological basis of equal distribution, and Marx's concept of labor and value, then he invites open discussion.

He clings to the capitalistic idea of wages, remuneration, labor tokens, and speaks about "Ensuring to each *individual* neither more nor less than the full value of his *individual product*." Also "Out of which product he would have to provide for his own needs and the needs of his dependents."

In another place, "Each individual being obliged out of his own earnings, *which are proportionate to his exertions*, to provide for his own needs, and for the needs of his family."

Marx demonstrated that use commodities have only a use value, and that exchange value was a capitalistic fetish, as exchange value is resolved under capitalistic production into money.

That this transformation of use value into money reduces labor power to the status of a marketable commodity.

These conditions would disappear with the passing of capitalism into co-operation.

Marx further demonstrated that the social product is the result of social labor, abstract human labor, and as such can have no longer an absolute computable individualistic value.

For instance, what is the full value of a ditch digger's product? And what is the full value of a thousand ditch diggers' product, working with pick and shovel, compared to a thousand diggers' product working with the new steam ditch-digging machines?

And when we talk of the time-price of production, we invariably compute the time value of the production of social necessities. It is otherwise impossible to find the time value of the

full product of the ditch-digger's hour, the piano teacher's, the doctor's, the stoker's, engineer's, etc., hour.

There is no other way of computing the full product of these classes except by an equal share in the socially necessary use-commodities. Therefore there can be no unequal remuneration, paid in money, or labor tokens, based upon the ratio of the individual's intense or lax exertions.

So much for the first two accusations. The biological basis of scientific socialism is the law of the greatest evolution of organisms and species under the most favorable environment. Now, if we are to have a substratum, a proletariat, in the Co-operative Commonwealth, lax, indigent, slothful and *badly paid* in consequence; having a too numerous progeny, and being obliged to support this family out of their meager *wages*, I do not see how it could be a conducive environment to physical, mental, moral or esthetic development. The burden of consequences for the father's inefficiency would fall then, as now, upon innocent shoulders, the shoulders of helpless mothers and children. One might as well urge the retention in solitary confinement of the thief, burglar and forger, after the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth. If any need the best of environment to rehumanize them and raise them to the evolutionary plane of their fellows, it is the present substratum of the working class, and the outcasts.

An environment which keeps them down, acts as a drag to the evolutionary progress of the whole race. Therefore this substratum need an equal share of the use-commodities, and a considerably greater share of education, music, refining surrounding and intercourse, than would Comrade Buck or Comrades Simons, or Herron.

Then, if we perpetuate the proletariat by the system of unequal remuneration, we will always be threatened by revolution of the proletariat. But this is what Comrade Buck wants, because he is not a Socialist, but an Anarchist (Communist?). Refer to pages 161 and 162. Therefore he foresees three stages of Socialism.

First, unequal remuneration Socialism. Second, Bellamy's military Communism. Third, Anarchist Communism, Johann Most's. So he hopes that the repression of unequal remuneration will force a second revolution, and the restrictions of military Communism a third revolt, and then perfection will be attainable.

But he places this thousands of years in the future, so that it can only concern us in the immediate present to get all we can while we are at it, and we can only get that through equal distribution of the total social product.

He speaks on page 158 about the effort necessary to overcome natural inertia, and speaks of the stimulus of reward proportioned to the energy expended to obtain this reward as being necessary to overcome the aforementioned natural inertia. This is the capital-

istic argument of *incentive*, always brought forward to show that under Socialism there would be no incentive to improve, create and invent.

As though the incentive of an equal share in the nation's total social product of music, art, commodities, etc., were not incentive enough for the starving, expropriated proletaire!

Again, the editor takes exception to his statement that economic well-being is noted by an increased birth rate. Statistics at present prove the exact opposite.

Is it to be supposed that under a system of equal distribution, that all women would have offspring every eighteen months during the normal period of their child-bearing life?

Comrade Buck had best ask the Socialist women of the world, or of the United States, whether such is their intention.

I think their reply would startle him. They would answer to a woman that, as they expected to be free economically, they also expected to have something better to occupy their time than merely gratifying masculine scortatory passion and having an unnumbered progeny.

A closer knowledge of women, and of the proletariat, might show Comrade Buck that there were more things than were dreamt of in his philosophy.

As a colossal monument of the peculiar imaginings of a pessimist philosophy, his article is a wonder. Viewed in the light of practical mathematical demonstration it is but the baseless fabric of a dream. Abstract labor creates the total social product. Abstract labor must own the total social product.

The abstract labor of one individual out of many millions has no peculiar relative value that is greater or less than each of the other millions.

The abstract labor of one individual is therefore relatively equal in value to each of the other millions.

Therefore each individual is entitled to an equal share, WHEN HE WORKS, of the total social product.

Therefore the Socialist proposes time checks, having a purchasing power designated by their fractional numerator of the total necessary labor time to produce the total labor product. Translated into present parlance, twenty-five million laborers labor seventy-five million hours per diem for two hundred days per annum to create the total necessary social product.

We will suppose, then, that one hour's time check will equal the present purchasing power of one dollar (though an hour's time check will probably be worth more than a dollar is now). If a given individual, for any reason whatever, real or fictitious, will only work one hour a day for one hundred days, he will only have time checks to the amount of one hundred dollars. So here is your Utopia of unequal remuneration for the slothful and industrious.

But if the said individual *can* only work one hour for one hundred days, he shall be entitled to the full income of three hours for two hundred days' necessary social labor, or six hundred dollars.

So it becomes evident that, notwithstanding the principle of equal distribution will prevail in making every hour's time check for whatever labor performed, equal in purchasing value to every other's hour's time check in all the varied industries of the nation, yet it operates to prevent equal distribution where unmerited. Otherwise it will operate according to the law of the parable—at least for a long time—of always tending toward equal distribution yet not reaching it.

This seems at present to be the only just method of distribution, and one that seems to meet with the approval of all classes, especially those who are terribly concerned about the class of people who won't work.

"What are you Socialists going to do with the fellows who won't work?"

This is a question I have had to answer probably one million times in twenty-five years. Yet I have always found that the time check theory satisfied these questioners, who thought that Socialism and Communism are one and the same thing. And as the time check system leaves the quantity of each individual's product, or the intensity of his exertion uncoerced, it naturally becomes an incentive to overcome *natural inertia*, and a *stimulus* to attain increased productiveness, and an equal distribution.

For if the aforementioned 25,000,000 will but work, each one of them and altogether, the average necessary labor time, then each and every one of them will have an equal amount of time checks, which will mean equal distribution of their total product.

CHAS. F. PURDY.

EDITORIAL

Trade Unions Not Political Parties.

It is a fact of which Socialists continually lose sight that the trade union and a political party have two distinct, though closely allied, fields of activity. For this reason, Socialist resolutions by trade unions are of little more effect than would be strike orders by Socialist parties. We say now, as we said last year, that the passage or the defeat of a Socialist resolution by the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor is of no importance except as a means of advertising and to a very trifling extent as measuring the growth of Socialist sentiment among the rank and file. For reasons pointed out by Comrade Hayes, elsewhere in this number, it is really of less importance on this last point than is ordinarily thought.

Everywhere this confusion of function of the two phases of the class struggle finds expression in Socialist speeches and papers. Yet every attempt of the union to usurp the political field has been as fatal as have been the occasional corresponding attempts of political parties to invade the union field through the organization of "federal unions" for purposes of political propaganda. If the union can perform the work of political action, then, what need have we for a Socialist Party? The fact that when the union itself attempts to enter the political field by the adoption of socialist resolutions, or even incorporates sections of the socialist platforms into its constitution, it does not have any great effect on the political outlook, has been shown time and again. Perhaps it received its most striking confirmation at the last election when the A. L. U. membership in Colorado seem to have voted almost unanimously for Populist candidates, since the socialist vote of the state can almost be accounted for without the votes of the A. L. U.

There has been very little connection between the passage of socialist resolutions, or the capture of socialist central bodies in any state or municipality, and the progress of the socialist vote. Indeed there has been even less than would naturally be expected, since some cities in which the central labor body is practically controlled by socialists and where the official organ of the trade union is a socialist propaganda paper, the progress of the party seems slowest. We do not claim to say that this is cause and effect. Indeed, we believe that in the majority of cases the reverse is true, and that when trade union affairs are in the control of men who have the wider outlook upon the class struggle which socialism gives, the result will be beneficial both to the trade union and to the socialist movement. It is of the greatest importance, however, that any such capture should be preceded by the conversion of a majority of the rank and file in the trade union field. Here, as elsewhere, socialism cannot depend upon the conversion of leaders. The control of the leader without the backing of the rank and file would be rather disastrous than otherwise.

It must always be remembered that the trade union membership, for

various reasons, is most susceptible to socialist propaganda. They are men who have at least recognized the existence of the class struggle on the economic field and, as has been pointed out by many socialist writers, this struggle continually leads them into the corresponding political struggle. But so long as the ruling thought of society comes from capitalist sources, the action of trade unions in the political field may or may not be a clear reflection of working class interests. These points have been so frequently covered in socialist literature that they need not detain us longer, and there is still another point to be considered at this time.

The Socialist Party has now grown to a point where its friendship is of value, and it is easily possible that we shall ere long see trade unions seeking Socialist Party endorsement as often as the reverse. This endorsement once given may easily be made use of in a manner which will be injurious to the socialist movement. It may involve the Socialist Party in trade union controversies which have no relation to the real task of socialism. The fakir may invade socialist trade unions as well as pure and simple unions, although there is no doubt but what we will have a much more thorny road to travel in a union whose members have once begun to grasp the fundamental principles of socialism.

It has been one of the principal aims of this magazine, as we have frequently said, to publish studies of American industrial conditions. We are now glad to announce that during the next year we will undertake what we believe to be one of the most valuable studies of this sort yet published. Mrs. May Wood Simons and A. M. Simons are preparing a study of concentration of industry and the trust movement which will appear during the coming year. We believe that a stage has been reached in this movement that enables it to be treated with much more completeness than was the case even a few months ago.

The study will begin with a theoretical discussion of concentration in industry, consolidation being considered as an historic stage in capitalism. The conditions of concentration, such as an enlarged circle of the market, perfected factory system, developed banking facilities, corporate organization of industry, etc., will be pointed out. The various stages in concentration with their logical connection and the economics of the trust as given both by capitalist and socialist writers will be discussed. This will form an introduction to the work, the main portion of which will be devoted to an historic study of concentration in this country.

The condition of industry at the close of the Civil War will be taken up and the conditions considered which made possible the growth of great capitalist industries. The gradual development of concentration from one industry to another, the part played by certain great basic industries in the general consolidation, the effect of the panics of 1873 and 1894, and other historic features in this evolution will be some of the points covered.

Then will follow a survey of the recent movements in concentration, closing with a study of further evolution and probable results. Throughout the work special emphasis will be laid on the effect of these great industrial movements on the laboring class, particularly on the trade union and the wage bargain. The manner in which the industrial classes which were developed by these movements have expressed themselves in political parties will be given thorough consideration. We believe that such a study will be found to be of special value during a campaign year and will present a great amount of material for the use of socialist workers.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Austria.

The National Convention of the Social Democratic Labor Party of Austria met at Vienna on November 9. The sessions were held in the Arbeiterheim (labor home), which belongs to the Social Democratic organization of the Tenth district of Vienna. The hall seats 2,000 and is elaborately decorated with socialist mottoes and portraits of the great socialist workers. One hundred and forty delegates were present, of whom 74 were German, 39 Bohemian, 15 Poles, 6 Ruthenians, 3 Italians and 3 Slavs. Eight of these delegates were members of the Reichsrath.

The report of the party organization declared that during the last two years great advances had been made. This is shown by the different elections that have been held which have everywhere given considerable increase of votes. The union movement has also grown in the most satisfactory manner. The report also describes the massacres of laborers which have taken place during times of strike, in which many laborers were killed and wounded.

The delegate from Dalmatia reported the founding of a Socialist Party in that country, the holding of numerous meetings, and the establishment of various local organizations. The efforts at agitation were met with the most brutal suppression on the part of the government.

The report of the parliamentary fraction told of the work which had been done in legislative bodies. The action of the fraction in working for a reduction of the period of military service from three years to two was attacked by several members on the ground that it was a compromise with militarism, but nevertheless the report was unanimously adopted.

The question of a general strike, which is of special importance to the Austrian movement since they have still to gain universal suffrage, was discussed at some length. The general opinion seemed to be very well voiced by Dr. Adler when he said that "if the political conditions are ready, and if the masses of the laborers are so disposed, and the necessary organization exists, then we are ready to do what we can in regard to a general strike; when and how we shall act remains to be seen. But until that time I am satisfied that the Convention must reject a general strike."

On the subject of the International Congress Dr. Adler said that the Austrian Socialists were little interested in the discussion between the revisionists and the revolutionists since these questions had never risen in Austria.

A report on the co-operative movement stated that there existed at the present time in Austria 170 co-operative organizations with 53,000 members and a capital of 17,000,000 kronen. Some of the delegates attacked the idea of associating the co-operative movement with the socialist movement, declaring that while no one could deny that the labor movement might be benefited by co-operatives it was also true that it could

be injured, since cheapening prices might easily tend to a lower standard of life. Furthermore the desire for dividends aroused the "beast of private property" in the membership and tended to weaken the revolutionary attitude of the working classes.

The Woman's Social Democratic organization met at the same time in the same city as did the Socialist Convention. There were sixty delegates present representing thirty organizations in Vienna, and nineteen from the provinces. It was reported that the organization of trade unions among the women was proceeding rapidly and that at the present time there were 11,000 women in the Austrian trade unions. A resolution that all women should work with the political organization of the Socialists and assist in all political activity was adopted unanimously. It was also decided to urge upon the Socialist parties of the world the necessity of giving more prominence to the demand for woman suffrage.

Bohemia.

The first National Congress of the Bohemian Social Democratic party was held on the 28th and 29th of last June at Prague, with fifty-eight of the *Vertrauensmänner* of the party, four members of the executive committee and seven members of the National Council of Bohemia. The conference occupied itself with the discussion of the means of propaganda. During the last two years 808 political meetings have been held to advocate universal suffrage for the Landtag, insurance for the aged and the sick, to fight militarism, alcoholism and the tariff. At the last election to the Landtag the party had candidates in fifty-one electoral districts.

England.

The protection proposals of Chamberlain seem to have furnished to some degree at least the jar which Comrade Hyndman has so long told us was necessary to rouse the working class spirit of England. For the first time it looks as though there was really going to be a real vital socialist movement along revolutionary lines in that country. With apparently all his old-time vigor Comrade Hyndman is carrying on a lecture tour that is stirring England as no socialist activity has ever stirred it before. Everywhere we hear of the largest halls crowded to overflowing to listen to him. At the same time the I. L. P. seems to be drifting nearer and nearer to liberalism.

Italy.

After the recent Cabinet crisis in Italy, it was generally believed that the new Cabinet could not be formed without the assistance of the Socialists, and the Ministry undertook to enter into negotiations with Turati and Bissolati as to the terms upon which one of them would enter the Cabinet. These men, of course, had no authority whatever to speak for the Socialist Party, but owing to their well known revisionist tendencies they were selected by the capitalist government. Fortunately, in spite of their revisionist attitude, they refused to enter except upon certain conditions. These conditions, which were in the nature of certain labor laws, the government refused to accede to. The revolutionary socialists were of course opposed to the whole proposition and had n part in this dickering and were very

glad when the whole matter fell through, thus saving Italy the trouble of a Millerand case.

Ferri, through *Avanti*, continues his attack on the government. He exposed such a state of corruption in connection with the Minister of Marine Bettolo that the latter, after first vainly seeking to deny the allegations, finally admitted their truth by resigning, and is now pushing a libel suit against Ferri. At the first meeting of the court *Vorwaerts* states, "that the streets were filled with militia and police in order to prevent any popular demonstration by the working class in favor of Ferri."

Some time ago he showed up the dishonesty of the minister of finance, who first denied all the accusations, and, supported by the capitalist press, has proposed to bring suit. But when Ferri pressed the charges home, and brought evidence of the truth of his accusations, the minister committed suicide, thus tacitly admitting his guilt.

The uncompromising attacks on capitalist officials seem to be getting Ferri into trouble in various ways, as the item from the *Vorwaerts* shows:

"ROME, Nov. 14.—At noon today, as Comrade Ferri was returning from the editorial office of the *Avanti*, he was met at the door of his house by a young man who introduced himself as the son of Senator Roux, publisher of the *Tribuna*, and demanded that Ferri cease his attacks on his (Roux's) father. Naturally Ferri replied that no threats would prevent him from fulfilling his duty as journalist, whereupon with a mass of abuse young Roux threw himself upon Ferri and sought to strike him. With a well aimed blow upon the nose Ferri stretched out his assailant, who, however, recovered himself and again attacked Ferri. But some laborers came running up and held the rash youth while Ferri quietly walked to his house. Such outrages as these are the natural results of the campaign of some of the 'organs of the established order' who have taken as their motto, 'Against the Socialists nothing will avail but force.' In this case even force seems not to have helped. *Avanti* will continue to do its duty and young Roux can spend the next fortnight in curing his nose."

The Socialist Club at Mantua has come to the conclusion that the revisionists have departed so far from Socialist principles that a parting of the ways is necessary and advise a division of the party. It also criticises the revolutionary wing as being ultra extreme.

Japan.

Recent events in Japan continue to duplicate the history of Socialism in other countries. We learn that two men have been driven from one of the daily papers because they were socialists, and of the formation of two new Socialist Clubs, one at Waseda College and another in the city of Wakayama.

The editor of "The Socialist," Comrade Katayama, is on trial for the publication and distribution of socialist literature, and the Japanese government seems to be determined to try the same tactics that have been tried by the opponents of socialism in every other country.

A book of poems entitled "A Collection of Poems of Socialism," written by Kwagai Kodama, has also been confiscated by the government. "The Socialist" says: "Will these petty persecutions stop the growth of socialism in Japan? Far from it. Socialism is now studied more and more in every rank of society. We hear many talk of socialism and find believers in it among primary school teachers. Come, persecution and oppression! Socialism will grow like spring grasses under snow."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Boston.—The convention of the American Federation of Labor that has just closed will not go thundering down the corridors of time as epoch-making. In fact, this year's gathering of labor legislators was 'way below the standard, and but for the debate on socialism, which occupied a day, the session would have been almost without interest.

To begin with the officers' reports, they showed a very good increase in membership and considerable progress in the matter of raising wages and shortening the hours of labor. It should be noted right here that there has been a tendency in recent years on the part of Federation officials to usurp to themselves the credit for the gains that have been made in union memberships and wages increased and hours of labor reduced, when as a matter of fact the Washington office has had little or nothing to do with the concessions secured. The campaigns of organization are not directed from Washington, nor the battles that are fought upon the industrial field. These moves are made at the direction of and by national and local unions. It is the obscure and voluntary local organizers who do the upbuilding and make the sacrifices; it is the local union business agents and organization committees who bring in the new members, who make demands for better conditions and strike and boycott, and, after they have won their hard fought battles, some of our national officials swell out with pride, gather at their annual mutual admiration feast and claim all the credit as being due to "our policies." And the worst of it is that many of the rank and file believe and applaud them for what the members themselves have done. The labor movement can be likened to military operations, when those who do the fighting are forgotten and the generals who sit in their tents in the rear of the army receive all the credit, with this difference that in labor circles the rank and file and non-commissioned officers initiate all the moves to be made, while in military affairs such is not the case. The trade union movement is approaching the danger point of losing its democracy and establishing a bureaucracy.

This unwelcome fact becomes apparent when one considers how guardedly many of the delegates from national unions discussed general questions and how they hesitated to take a firm stand upon propositions that were unpopular, though correct in principle. They seemed to fear that they might offend some one, and that their acts might cause temporary disadvantages. Several delegates dreaded the consequences of criticising our capitalistic brethren or going on record against the profit system for fear that such actions might make it difficult to secure concessions from employers. Others become quite alarmed at the timely suggestion that a note of warning be sounded to organized labor that a period of industrial depression was approaching, holding that such an honest statement of fact would prove injurious.

Coming down to trade union politics, the discussion upon socialism revealed a curious condition of affairs. Scores of delegates declared em-

phatically in private conversation that they were just as good socialists as the next man, but to vote for a resolution this year would be bad policy because they were interested in jurisdiction controversies, and to make a stand now would prove hurtful to them, and, then, anyhow, the rank and file of their members, they asserted, were not socialists. In fact, I could name half a dozen delegates who deliberately voted contrary to the action of the conventions of their national unions in order to gain support, or at least ward off criticism, in their jurisdiction grievances.

The debate upon socialism early in the discussion showed plainly that the conservatives were determined to make amends for the criticisms that had been heaped upon the trade unions since the New Orleans convention of a year ago by the Parrys and Hannas. As in former years, the socialists confined themselves strictly to a discussion of facts, showing the developments in industry and present conditions in our social system, and pointed out the necessity of political unity to meet the attacks of combined capital. They dwelt upon the president's report to the effect that not only were no advantages secured from congress and the state legislatures, but labor's opponents were actually making steady encroachments upon our liberties—that labor bills were strangled, labor laws declared unconstitutional, the boycott outlawed, the blacklist legalized, government by injunction made permanent, police and militia continuously employed against the workers, and, finally, the damage suit was being utilized to confiscate treasuries and smash unions. But all appeals were in vain. One might as well have directed his words at so many statues in marble for all the impression they made. Not that alone, but those who preached political and industrial unity of the working class were denounced more severely than if they were Parryized trade union wreckers. President Gompers, who always reserves to himself the right to close the debate, was especially harsh. Like nearly all of those who speak from the conservative side, his whole speech was composed of personalities and appeals to prejudices. Advocates of socialism, he declared, were not good trade unionists, although some of them perhaps made as many and more sacrifices than he ever did or ever will. He charged that the socialists were conspiring to "capture" the trade union movement and seemed to think that they had no right in the organizations, while, as is well known, if they do not join they are roundly condemned for standing aloof. In a word, the speeches opposing socialism were such as could be endorsed by all class-conscious capitalists. I am willing to wager something that the Washington officials will not publish a verbatim report of the socialist debate, despite the fact that an official stenographer was employed to copy the proceedings.

Unquestionably the bulk of the Socialist Party is composed of trade unionists, but that does not mean that a majority of the members of organized labor are socialists. It is, therefore, useless to expect that converts can be made of the officials, and every socialist ought to bend his energies to gain adherents for his cause among the rank and file. When the latter begin to move in earnest there will be some lively sidestepping done by the "leaders." And the day is not far distant when some of the gentlemen who are now surfeited with power, and who are absolutely merciless in their unfair attacks upon those who have the manhood to plead for the abolition of capitalism and its wage slave system, will find that those whom they trust most as loyal followers will be the first to turn on them. History has a habit of repeating itself, and so far as the adherents of socialism in the trade unions are concerned they are perfectly willing to submit their case to the historians of the labor movement, to the despoiled workers of today and the emancipated toilers of the morrow.

While the charge that the socialists were making an organized attempt to "capture" the trade unions is without foundation, for the very good reason that such a scheme would be of no benefit where the majority are

opposed to their principles, there were nearly twice as many advocates of socialism in the Boston convention as were present in New Orleans, which is a pretty safe indication that the tide of socialism is steadily rising and that within the next few years those who stand for political as well as industrial progress will increase in numbers very materially.

When the trade unions become pretty thoroughly socialistic, then the socialists will undoubtedly take control, and then there will be no danger of reaction. Under present circumstances it would be suicidal to attempt to place a socialist in the presidential position. Let the triumphant opposition control the situation and use its power while it is in the enjoyment thereof. It is immaterial to us whether a Gompers, Duncan or dark horse is elected president of the Federation just at present, and the rumors of plots and conspiracies during the year to effect changes merely afford amusement for the time being. There are no disappointments among the radical element. As one of the conservatives naively remarked: "They have the arguments, but we have the votes."

Little or no progress was made in adjusting the many jurisdiction controversies that are clearly the outcome of changing methods of production and distribution, but which the exponents of narrow craft organizations, or autonomists, seem unable to comprehend. Quite likely the struggle between some of the national unions will continue during the year as formerly, to the great satisfaction of their capitalistic masters, who are organizing trusts and associations. Probably on this question, as that of political action, there will soon come a revolution of thought that will serve to solidify the movement more compactly than ever and place it upon the right road to accomplish its mission, namely, to play its part in overthrowing capitalism and establishing a co-operative commonwealth.

BOOK REVIEWS

The One Woman. Thomas Dixon, Jr. Doubleday, Page & Co. Cloth, 350 pp. \$1.50.

Another sign of the growing strength of socialism is seen in the fact that the literary hacks are beginning to write anti-socialist books. This particular volume is in many ways an example of the effect of capitalism in the world of letters. It is written on the "penny dreadful" style, with characters that are caricatures and, if dramatized, would delight the crowd who throng to the melodramas with "plenty of killin'." So far as socialism is concerned we can simply give the author the old alternative of the fool or the knave. There is nothing in the book that shows that he knows anything about socialism excepting a few haphazard quotations which have no essential connection with socialist philosophy. We have had this sort of novel treating of almost every other subject, and it was inevitable that sooner or later some searcher after sensational themes should light upon socialism. When he had "discovered" this new theme, the next question was, on which side was the great majority of readers, and from the literary style of the book there was but one answer to this question. It was upon the side of the defenders of capitalism, so, of course, he took that side. The ghouliness characteristic of the modern reporter in search of a sensation is his. He has hung his story on the actions of two prominent socialists and has felt the more safe in so doing since their well known non-resistant principles protected him from a libel suit. Yet taking his distorted facts as a basis he is still unable to make any strong case against socialism. After howling and shrieking through some 250 pages about the way in which socialism destroys the family, he finally has his one great knight errant of the established order and defender of that sacred institution sneak into another man's house and win the affections of his wife, for which he is killed by the free-love socialist (?) husband. The first wife of the socialist (?) then comes to the rescue, intercedes with the governor and obtains a pardon.

Some of his choice criticisms of socialism are as follows: "Socialism takes the temper out of the steel fibre of character; it makes a man feeble." And this in the face of the countless martyrs who have died in the name of socialism the world over, of a Liebknecht and Bebel who have turned aside from the richest rewards of capitalism to accept imprisonment and ostracism through half a lifetime, or a Marx writing out the fundamentals of socialism with a child lying unburied, for lack of funds, which but the slightest waving to the side of the enemy would have secured. And all this from an intellectual spineless prostitute, who will write a book like "The One Woman."

After praising the man who is elected as governor, and denouncing the rule of the mob, he proceeds to a glorification of Tammany, and the Tammany mob, which out-demagogues anything to be found outside of the

actual facts of Tammany politics. Verily, socialism need have no fear of such weapons.

Mazzini: the Prophet of the Religion of Humanity. By Louis J. Rosenberg. Cloth, uncut pages, 86 pp. 50 cents: Charles H. Kerr & Co.

Of all the characters who arose out of the confused revolutionary movement of the 40's in Europe, Mazzini was certainly the most picturesque and in many ways one of the most typical. He fell far short of ever comprehending the revolutionary socialist point of view, and, indeed, must be looked upon largely as a middle class reformer.

As a writer, he has had few equals, and he must always remain one of those characters whom it is necessary to know if we are to gain a thorough understanding of the conditions from which sprang the International Socialist movement.

This little volume, finely printed with wide margins, on heavy paper, is perhaps as convenient a summary of his teachings and survey of his life as could be prepared. It is written by an ardent admirer who overlooks all defects, although the following summing up gives a hint of his weaknesses:

"Like most prophets, Mazzini was not practical, and like most prophets, he was somewhat obstinate. He believed *his* ideas were the most correct, and was ready to pay with his life for them. Like most prophets, he was very conscious of his mission, and like most prophets, he believed himself to stand at the head of his age. But again, like most prophets, he does it in so innocent, earnest and sincere a manner, that we cannot charge him with ambition."

The work is divided into three books, the life, a survey of his teachings, and his greatest address, the one entitled "To the Young Men of Italy."

Tolstoi and His Message. Ernest Howard Crosby: Funk & Wagnalls. Cloth, 93 pp. 50 cents.

Here we have in condensed handy form a sketch of Tolstoi's life and a summary of his more important doctrines from the pen of his foremost American follower. Mr. Crosby is not, however, a blind follower, but sometimes criticises, and quite sharply, his master. Yet, on the whole, the work of that of a disciple. Perhaps it is better so, for only a disciple can interpret Tolstoi in patience.

The work is written in the easy, enlivening style that is characteristic of all Mr. Crosby's works. The chapter which he offers on Christian teaching and practice is an endeavor to show that in the case of the Quakers, the Moravians and some others, the principles of non-resistance worked well in practice. His story of the Moravian massacre, however, is not exactly in accord with the statements of other historians, as the common report is that the non-resistant Moravians allowed themselves to become a shield behind which their more savage neighbors committed all sorts of atrocities upon the American pioneers. And this would seem to be the common and probable outcome of any attempt to carry on doctrines of non-resistance today.

There is no denying the fact, however, that Tolstoi is one of the great figures of the nineteenth century, and this little book is certainly the handiest way to get an idea of his teachings for those who are too busy or too indolent to read the voluminous works of Tolstoi himself.

The Monarch Billionaire. Morrison I. Swift: J. S. Ogilvie Publishing Company. Cloth, 317 pp. \$1.00.

There have been countless attempts to write "the Socialist novel," but none have yet been written that deserve that title, and the present volume falls behind some of those which have already been issued. It has some defects that are common to such attempts. After the first fifty pages the author forgets about his plot and sets all his characters to making long speeches. The author has at times a short, trenchant style, and the work contains many quotable things. For instance, he has his typical capitalist say "if 10,000 men had nothing to eat and the hoarders of the food supply should beckon one of them and feed him, the rest of the starved crowd would exclaim 'we are all fed and now we belong to the eating class.'" Some of the long speeches are very good and others indifferent. The author is still caught in the idealistic method of thought and makes his socialist seeker declare that "there is no science of history or economic evolution; there are no fixed laws of industrial growth; the controlling force is in the men of the time, and what they may do is uncertain; it rests with their intelligence and degree of will."

One great defect of the book, which can but doom it to oblivion, is that it is dull, notwithstanding the occasional flashes of brilliancy. It might have had some influence had the author openly set it forth as an economic treatise, since then those who are interested in technical economics would have been willing to overcome its dullness. But sent forth as a novel it must fail to arouse any great attention.

Revolutionary Essays in Socialist Faith and Fancy. Peter E. Burrowes: The Comrade Publishing Company. Cloth, 320 pp. \$1.25.

This is a book from which to quote, a work to be read in sections, and not as a whole. It is too condensed, too epigrammatic for continuous reading. You can open it almost anywhere and find something that, if you were an exchange editor on a socialist paper, you would mark with a blue pencil for reproduction. We predict that for years and years to come this will prove a storehouse for the socialist paragraphers.

It is hard to say which of the essays are the best. All are good. Many of them have appeared in different socialist publications, including the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW*. Those of our readers who have read those that have so appeared will want to read the rest. It is a good book to take along with you on a vacation.

Two new issues of the well known Pocket Library of Socialism attract our attention. These are: "Socialism and the Organized Labor Movement," by May Wood Simons, and "The Capitalist's Union or Labor Unions: Which?," published by Union 7386, A. F. of L., for the affiliated unions, and are sold by Charles H. Kerr & Co. at 5 cents each. Of the first, Eugene V. Debs says: "It is clear, logical, unanswerable. The simplest mind can grasp the argument and its conclusions are inevitable. If the average Trade Unionist who, in his ignorance, has his face set against socialism would but read this brief economic study with open mind, he could not escape the logic of socialism." The second is a general survey of the conditions that confront organized labor at the present time, and show how these conditions will compel the unions to take political action along the line of socialism.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

A \$50,000 SOCIALIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.

The regular annual meeting of the stockholders of Charles H. Kerr & Co. will be held at the company's office, 56 Fifth avenue, Chicago, on January 15, 1904, at 2 p. m. At that meeting a proposition will be voted upon to increase the authorized capital stock of the company from \$10,000 to \$50,000, by authorizing the issue of 4,000 additional shares of stock at \$10 each. An official announcement of this will be made through the *Chicago Socialist*, and through circulars mailed to the present stockholders, but in this department of the REVIEW some further details will not be out of place.

And, first of all, the announcement does not mean that the co-operative company is selling out to any capitalist or any group of capitalists. On the contrary, the ownership of the company is more firmly vested in the Socialist Party than ever before, and the effect of the proposed revision of the charter will be in the course of a comparatively short time to place it in a position where its future will be secure, irrespective of the life or death of any individual.

Of the thousand shares authorized by our present charter, the greatest number held by any individual is a little over a hundred still standing in the name of Charles H. Kerr, and one or more of these are being transferred nearly every day to single holders. They would last only a few weeks more, at the present rate of stock subscriptions, and that is why an amended charter is necessary.

The meaning of all this is that our co-operative plan for supplying socialist books at cost has passed the stage of experiment. It has proved a complete success. It has placed the management of the company in a position where we can afford to consider, regarding a proposed publication, not whether it is "popular" enough to appeal to the enthusiasm of the ignorant, but whether it is an able presentation of international socialism. We have now seven hundred and fifty stockholders with whom we are in regular communication, and we are thus able to find an immediate sale for any new socialist book that is worth reading, while we can safely let alone such books as we believe are not worth reading.

So much has been done, but much more remains to be done. In our urgent need for providing the standard books of international socialism, we have been obliged to use capital lent us by comrades who may soon need it again, and we have also to some extent utilized our credit with banks and printers. To put the future safety of the company beyond doubt, several thousand dollars in stock ought to be subscribed at once, in order that the business may be put upon a strictly cash basis and kept there.

We do not ask any one to subscribe for more than one share, for we believe it is best to keep the control as widely scattered among the socialists of America as possible. This company is already more directly controlled by the Socialist Party of the United States as a whole than any other publishing house, and every share subscribed from now on will

make it less and less possible for any individual in any future situation that may ever arise to use the resources of this publishing house in any other way than to promote the cause of international socialism. Are you a stockholder? If not, send on \$10 for a share, or if that is more money than the capitalists allow you to have at one time, then do as most of our stockholders have done, pay a dollar a month for ten months. You can buy books at cost as soon as you have paid your first dollar.

BOOKS FOR THE CHRISTMAS SEASON.

The Sale of an Appetite, by Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr and illustrated by Dorothy Deene, is fully described on page 319 of last month's REVIEW. It is a thoroughly charming story and is printed in luxurious holiday style, not the economical style which we are forced to use in our strictly propaganda literature, where the main point is to give as many pages of socialism as can possibly be afforded for each penny. "The Sale of an Appetite" is pretty enough to give to a laborer who imagines himself to be a capitalist, and it may start him to thinking before he knows the risk he is running. Try being a socialist Santa Claus, and watch the results. Price, 50 cents.

Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History. By Antonio Labriola, professor in the University of Rome. Translated from the latest Paris edition by Charles H. Kerr. The publication of this book, announced for November, has been unavoidably delayed in the printing, but the electrotype plates are completed and on the press as this issue of the REVIEW is mailed, and all orders for the book will be filled before the holidays. It is not too much to say that Labriola's *Essays* is the most important socialist book which has appeared since Marx's *Capital*. It is a necessary supplement to the Communist Manifesto, explaining in detail the ideas which the Manifesto states in a form so condensed as to be too difficult for the ordinary reader. We do not mean to imply that the new book is itself easy reading. On the contrary, it demands careful study, but it will well repay all the study that is put on it. No socialist writer or speaker can afford to remain ignorant of Labriola's *Essays*, and every student who desires really to understand the subject of socialism will find this book absolutely indispensable. Price, \$1.

Poetical Works of Walt Whitman. With introduction by John Burroughs. Although Whitman wrote before there was an American socialist movement, he is distinctively the poet of American socialism, and his poems will prove a delight and an inspiration to American socialists. We have arranged with a leading New York publisher to print for us a special edition of Whitman, 359 pages, in handsome and substantial cloth binding, which we are enabled to offer at 75 cents, with our usual discount to stockholders.

Walt Whitman: The Poet of the Wider Selfhood. By Mila Tupper Maynard. This is an introduction to the study of the poet which will be an important aid to new readers. The author is doubly qualified by a thorough training in the study of literature and a clear understanding of the principles of socialism. Cloth, \$1.

Capital. By Karl Marx. We import the latest London edition, containing 847 large pages, handsomely bound in extra cloth, and printed from plates prepared with the minutest care under the personal supervision of Frederick Engels. This edition should not be confused with an unauthorized reprint, crowded into less than 600 pages, issued for private profit by a non-socialist publishing house in New York. Our edition retails for \$2, with the usual discounts to our stockholders.

The Standard Socialist Series. Eight uniform volumes, sold together or separately, as follows:

1. Karl Marx: Memoirs of Wilhelm Liebknecht, translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution. By Emile Vandervelde, translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. The American Farmer. Second edition, revised and enlarged. By A. M. Simons.
4. Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association. By Isaac Broome.
5. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc.
8. Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Austin Lewis. Cloth, 50 cents a volume; \$4 for the set.

Gracia, a Social Tragedy. By Frank Everett Plummer. A story in blank verse, with twelve half-tone engravings, each occupying a full page, most of them from art photographs posed expressly for this book. Handsomely bound in blue cloth with stamping in ink and gold; an elegant gift book for the holiday season. Price, \$1.25; descriptive circular on application.

Bound Volumes of the International Socialist Review. Three bound volumes are now ready, each containing the numbers for one year. For a short time longer they will be supplied at \$2 a volume, with the regular discounts to stockholders. The supply, however, is limited, and it will soon be necessary to raise the price on volumes remaining unsold.

SPECIAL PRICES TO STOCKHOLDERS.

Any of the books described in this announcement will be supplied to stockholders at a discount of one-half from the advertised price, provided they are called for at our office or sent by express at purchaser's expense. If, however, they are to be sent by mail or by express prepaid, the discount will only be 40 per cent; that is, we will mail a dollar book to a stockholder for 60 cents, and other books in cloth binding at proportionately low rates.

THE REVIEW FOR 1904.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for the coming year, in addition to the features which have hitherto made it indispensable to American socialists, will contain a series of original studies of the development of the American Trust, from the viewpoint of historical materialism. These studies will be of great propaganda as well as educational value, and will be a decided help to the Socialist Party in its presidential campaign. The REVIEW is well worth \$1 a year, and all combination offers to new subscribers are now withdrawn. The only way to get the REVIEW for less than \$1 will hereafter be to subscribe for stock in our co-operative company. No distinction will hereafter be made between new subscriptions and renewals. Stockholders will be allowed to purchase REVIEW post cards at 50 cents each, and these will be received for renewals as well as for new subscriptions.